

**CALIFORNIA REGIONAL WATER QUALITY CONTROL BOARD
CENTRAL VALLEY REGION**

11020 Sun Center Drive, #200 Rancho Cordova, California 95670-6114
Phone (916) 464-3291 • Fax (916) 464-4645
<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley>

**ORDER R5-2014-0007
NPDES NO. CA0084476**

**WASTE DISCHARGE REQUIREMENTS
FOR THE CITY OF LINCOLN
WASTEWATER TREATMENT AND RECLAMATION FACILITY
PLACER COUNTY**

The following Discharger is subject to waste discharge requirements (WDRs) set forth in this Order:

Table 1. Discharger Information

Discharger	City of Lincoln
Name of Facility	Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility
Facility Address	1245 Fiddymont Road
	Lincoln, CA 95468
	Placer County

Table 2. Discharge Location

Discharge Point	Effluent Description	Discharge Point Latitude (North)	Discharge Point Longitude (West)	Receiving Water
001	Tertiary Treated Municipal Wastewater	38° 52' 05" N	121° 21' 28" W	Auburn Ravine Creek

Table 3. Administrative Information

This Order was adopted on:	7 February 2014
This Order shall become effective on:	29 March 2014
This Order shall expire on:	1 February 2019
The Discharger shall file a Report of Waste Discharge as an application for reissuance of WDRs in accordance with title 23, California Code of Regulations, and an application for reissuance of a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit no later than:	180 days prior to the Order expiration date
The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (U.S. EPA) and the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region have classified this discharge as follows:	Major

I, **PAMELA CREEDON**, Executive Officer, do hereby certify that this Order with all attachments is a full, true, and correct copy of the Order adopted by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region, on the date indicated above.

Original Signed by

PAMELA C. CREEDON, Executive Officer

CONTENTS

I.	Facility Information	3
II.	Findings	3
III.	Discharge Prohibitions	4
IV.	Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications	4
	A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001	4
	1. Final Effluent Limitations – Filter Clearwell Internal Waste Stream Compliance Point (Monitoring Location INT-001)	4
	2. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001)	5
	3. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable	6
	B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable	6
	C. Recycling Specifications	6
V.	Receiving Water Limitations	6
	A. Surface Water Limitations	6
	B. Groundwater Limitations	8
VI.	Provisions	8
	A. Standard Provisions	8
	B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements	11
	C. Special Provisions	11
	1. Reopener Provisions	11
	2. Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements	12
	3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention	14
	4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications	14
	5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)	15
	6. Other Special Provisions	18
	7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable	19
VII.	Compliance Determination	19

TABLES

Table 1.	Discharger Information	1
Table 2.	Discharge Location	1
Table 3.	Administrative Information	1
Table 4.	Effluent Limitations – Filter Clearwell Internal Waste Stream Compliance Point	5
Table 5.	Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001	5

ATTACHMENTS

Attachment A –	Definitions	A-1
Attachment B –	Map	B-1
Attachment C –	Flow Schematic	C-1
Attachment D –	Standard Provisions	D-1
Attachment E –	Monitoring and Reporting Program	E-1
Attachment F –	Fact Sheet	F-1
Attachment G –	Summary of Reasonable Potential Analysis for Constituents of Concern	G-1
Attachment H –	Calculation of WQBELs	H-1
Attachment I –	Effluent and Receiving Water Characterization Study	I-1

I. FACILITY INFORMATION

Information describing the City of Lincoln, Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility (Facility) is summarized in Table 1 and in sections I and II of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F). Section I of the Fact Sheet also includes information regarding the Facility's permit application.

II. FINDINGS

The California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region (hereinafter Central Valley Water Board), finds:

- A. Legal Authorities.** This Order serves as WDRs pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. EPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as an NPDES permit for point source discharges from this Facility to surface waters.
- B. Background and Rationale for Requirements.** The Central Valley Water Board developed the requirements in this Order based on information submitted as part of the application, through monitoring and reporting programs, and other available information. The Fact Sheet (Attachment F), which contains background information and rationale for the requirements in this Order, is hereby incorporated into and constitutes Findings for this Order. Attachments A through E and G through I are also incorporated into this Order.
- C. Provisions and Requirements Implementing State Law.** The provisions/requirements in subsections IV.B, IV.C, and V.B are included to implement State law only. These provisions/requirements are not required or authorized under the federal CWA; consequently, violations of these provisions/requirements are not subject to the enforcement remedies that are available for NPDES violations.
- D. Monitoring and Reporting.** 40 CFR 122.48 requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program establishes monitoring and reporting requirements to implement federal and State requirements. The Monitoring and Reporting Program is provided in Attachment E.

The technical and monitoring reports in this Order are required in accordance with Water Code section 13267, which states the following in subsection (b)(1), *"In conducting an investigation specified in subdivision (a), the regional board may require that any person who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged discharging, or who proposes to discharge waste within its region, or any citizen or domiciliary, or political agency or entity of this state who has discharged, discharges, or is suspected of having discharged or discharging, or who proposes to discharge, waste outside of its region could affect the quality of waters within its region shall furnish, under penalty of perjury, technical or monitoring program reports which the regional board requires. The burden, including costs, of these reports shall bear a reasonable relationship to the need for the benefits to be obtained from the reports. In requiring those reports, the regional board shall provide the person with a written explanation with regard to the need for the reports, and shall identify the evidence that supports requiring that person to provide the reports."*

The Discharger owns, and Stantec Consulting Services, Inc. operates the Facility under contract with the Discharger. The monitoring reports required by this Order are necessary to

determine compliance with this Order. The need for the monitoring reports is discussed in the Fact Sheet.

- E. Notification of Interested Parties.** The Central Valley Water Board has notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDRs for the discharge and has provided them with an opportunity to submit their written comments and recommendations. Details of the notification are provided in the Fact Sheet.
- F. Consideration of Public Comment.** The Central Valley Water Board, in a public meeting, heard and considered all comments pertaining to the discharge. Details of the Public Hearing are provided in the Fact Sheet.

THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Order R5-2008-0156 is rescinded upon the effective date of this Order except for enforcement purposes, and, in order to meet the provisions contained in division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13000) and regulations adopted thereunder, and the provisions of the CWA and regulations and guidelines adopted thereunder, the Discharger shall comply with the requirements in this Order. This action in no way prevents the Central Valley Water Board from taking enforcement action for past violations of the previous Order.

III. DISCHARGE PROHIBITIONS

- A.** Discharge of wastewater at a location or in a manner different from that described in this Order is prohibited.
- B.** The by-pass or overflow of wastes to surface waters is prohibited, except as allowed by Federal Standard Provisions I.G. and I.H. (Attachment D).
- C.** Neither the discharge nor its treatment shall create a nuisance as defined in section 13050 of the Water Code.
- D.** The Discharger shall not allow pollutant-free wastewater to be discharged into the treatment or disposal system in amounts that significantly diminish the system's capability to comply with this Order. Pollutant-free wastewater means rainfall, groundwater, cooling waters, and condensates that are essentially free of pollutants.

IV. EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

A. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001

1. Final Effluent Limitations – Filter Clearwell Internal Waste Stream Compliance Point (Monitoring Location INT-001)

The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Filter Clearwell Internal Waste Stream Compliance Point, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location INT-001 as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E.

- a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the effluent limitations specified in Table 4:

Table 4. Effluent Limitations – Filter Clearwell Internal Waste Stream Compliance Point

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Conventional Pollutants						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--

- b. **Total Coliform Organisms.** Effluent total coliform organisms shall not exceed:
 - i. 2.2 most probable number (MPN) per 100 mL, as a 7-day median;
 - ii. 23 MPN/100 mL, more than once in any 30-day period; and
 - iii. 240 MPN/100 mL, at any time.
- c. **Average Dry Weather Flow**
 - i. Effective immediately, the average dry weather flow shall not exceed 4.2 million gallons per day (MGD);
 - ii. Effective upon compliance with VI.C.6.b.i, the average dry weather flow shall not exceed 5.9 MGD; and
 - iii. Effective upon compliance with Special Provision VI.C.6.b.i and ii, the average dry weather flow shall not exceed the flow rate approved by the Executive Officer up to a maximum of 8.4 MGD.

2. Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001)

The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the following effluent limitations at Discharge Point 001, with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as described in the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E:

- a. The Discharger shall maintain compliance with the effluent limitations specified in Table 5:

Table 5. Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Conventional Pollutants						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	30	45	60	--	--
	lbs/day ¹	3,050	4,580	6,100	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	30	45	60	--	--
	lbs/day ¹	3,050	4,580	6,100	--	--
Non-Conventional Pollutants						
Ammonia, Total (as N)	mg/L	0.7	--	2.1	--	--
	lbs/day ¹	71	--	214	--	--

¹ Based on an average daily discharge flow of 12.2 MGD.

- b. **Percent Removal:** The average monthly percent removal of 5-day biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅) and total suspended solids (TSS) shall not be less than 85 percent.
- c. **Acute Whole Effluent Toxicity.** Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:
 - i. 70%, minimum for any one bioassay; and
 - ii. 90%, median for any three consecutive bioassays.
- d. **Average Daily Discharge Flow.** The average daily discharge flow shall not exceed 12.2 MGD.
- e. **Mercury, total.**
 - i. Effective immediately, the total cumulative mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.022 pounds/month for a calendar month.
 - ii. Effective upon compliance with VI.C.6.b.i, the total cumulative mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.0234 pounds/month for a calendar month.
- f. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity.** There shall be no chronic toxicity in the effluent discharge.

3. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable

B. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable

C. Recycling Specifications

- 1. All uses of reclaimed water shall be in accordance with Master Reclamation Permit R5-2005-0040-01(as amended by Order R5-2012-0052), or subsequent orders, issued in accordance with Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations and the California Water Code.

V. RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A. Surface Water Limitations

The discharge shall not cause the following in Auburn Ravine Creek.

- 1. **Bacteria.** The fecal coliform concentration, based on a minimum of not less than five samples for any 30-day period, to exceed a geometric mean of 200 MPN/100 mL, nor more than 10 percent of the total number of fecal coliform samples taken during any 30-day period to exceed 400 MPN/100 mL.
- 2. **Biostimulatory Substances.** Water to contain biostimulatory substances which promote aquatic growths in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
- 3. **Chemical Constituents.** Chemical constituents to be present in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses.
- 4. **Color.** Discoloration that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
- 5. **Dissolved Oxygen:**
 - a. The monthly median of the mean daily dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 85 percent of saturation in the main water mass;
 - b. The 95 percentile dissolved oxygen concentration to fall below 75 percent of saturation; nor

- c. The dissolved oxygen concentration to be reduced below 7.0 mg/L at any time.
6. **Floating Material.** Floating material to be present in amounts that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
7. **Oil and Grease.** Oils, greases, waxes, or other materials to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance, result in a visible film or coating on the surface of the water or on objects in the water, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.
8. **pH.** The pH to be depressed below 6.5, raised above 8.5.
9. **Pesticides:**
 - a. Pesticides to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
 - b. Pesticides to be present in bottom sediments or aquatic life in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses;
 - c. Total identifiable persistent chlorinated hydrocarbon pesticides to be present in the water column at concentrations detectable within the accuracy of analytical methods approved by USEPA or the Executive Officer;
 - d. Pesticide concentrations to exceed those allowable by applicable antidegradation policies (see State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16 and 40 CFR 131.12.);
 - e. Pesticide concentrations to exceed the lowest levels technically and economically achievable;
 - f. Pesticides to be present in concentration in excess of the maximum contaminant levels set forth in CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 15; nor
 - g. Thiobencarb to be present in excess of 1.0 µg/L.
10. **Radioactivity:**
 - a. Radionuclides to be present in concentrations that are harmful to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life nor that result in the accumulation of radionuclides in the food web to an extent that presents a hazard to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
 - b. Radionuclides to be present in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs) specified in Table 64442 of section 64442 and Table 64443 of section 64443 of Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations.
11. **Suspended Sediments.** The suspended sediment load and suspended sediment discharge rate of surface waters to be altered in such a manner as to cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
12. **Settleable Substances.** Substances to be present in concentrations that result in the deposition of material that causes nuisance or adversely affects beneficial uses.
13. **Suspended Material.** Suspended material to be present in concentrations that cause nuisance or adversely affect beneficial uses.
14. **Taste and Odors.** Taste- or odor-producing substances to be present in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.

15. **Temperature.** The natural temperature to be increased by more than 5°F. Compliance to be determined based on the difference in temperature at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002.
16. **Toxicity.** Toxic substances to be present, individually or in combination, in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.
17. **Turbidity:**
 - a. The annual average turbidity to:
 - i. Exceed 2 nephelometric turbidity units (NTUs) where natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU, nor
 - ii. Increase more than 1 NTU where natural turbidity is between 1 and 5 NTUs.
 - b. The turbidity to increase:
 - i. More than 20 percent where natural turbidity is between 5 and 50 NTUs.
 - ii. More than 10 NTUs where natural turbidity is between 50 and 100 NTUs.
 - iii. More than 10 percent where natural turbidity is greater than 100 NTUs

B. Groundwater Limitations

1. Release of waste constituents from any storage, treatment, or disposal component associated with the Facility, shall not cause the underlying groundwater to contain waste constituents in concentrations greater than background water quality or water quality objectives, whichever is greater.

VI. PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions included in Attachment D.
2. The Discharger shall comply with the following provisions. In the event that there is any conflict, duplication, or overlap between provisions specified by this Order, the more stringent provision shall apply:
 - a. If the Discharger's wastewater treatment plant is publicly owned or subject to regulation by California Public Utilities Commission, it shall be supervised and operated by persons possessing certificates of appropriate grade according to Title 23, CCR, division 3, chapter 26.
 - b. After notice and opportunity for a hearing, this Order may be terminated or modified for cause, including, but not limited to:
 - i. violation of any term or condition contained in this Order;
 - ii. obtaining this Order by misrepresentation or by failing to disclose fully all relevant facts;
 - iii. a change in any condition that requires either a temporary or permanent reduction or elimination of the authorized discharge; and
 - iv. a material change in the character, location, or volume of discharge.

The causes for modification include:

- *New regulations.* New regulations have been promulgated under section 405(d) of the CWA, or the standards or regulations on which the permit was based have been changed by promulgation of amended standards or regulations or by judicial decision after the permit was issued.
- *Land application plans.* When required by a permit condition to incorporate a land application plan for beneficial reuse of sewage sludge, to revise an existing land application plan, or to add a land application plan.
- *Change in sludge use or disposal practice.* Under 40 CFR 122.62(a)(1), a change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practice is a cause for modification of the permit. It is cause for revocation and reissuance if the Discharger requests or agrees.

The Central Valley Water Board may review and revise this Order at any time upon application of any affected person or the Central Valley Water Board's own motion.

- c. If a toxic effluent standard or prohibition (including any scheduled compliance specified in such effluent standard or prohibition) is established under section 307(a) of the CWA, or amendments thereto, for a toxic pollutant that is present in the discharge authorized herein, and such standard or prohibition is more stringent than any limitation upon such pollutant in this Order, the Central Valley Water Board will revise or modify this Order in accordance with such toxic effluent standard or prohibition.

The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards and prohibitions within the time provided in the regulations that establish those standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified.

- d. This Order shall be modified, or alternately revoked and reissued, to comply with any applicable effluent standard or limitation issued or approved under sections 301(b)(2)(C) and (D), 304(b)(2), and 307(a)(2) of the CWA, if the effluent standard or limitation so issued or approved:
- i. Contains different conditions or is otherwise more stringent than any effluent limitation in the Order; or
 - ii. Controls any pollutant limited in the Order.

The Order, as modified or reissued under this paragraph, shall also contain any other requirements of the CWA then applicable.

- e. The provisions of this Order are severable. If any provision of this Order is found invalid, the remainder of this Order shall not be affected.
- f. The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize any adverse effects to waters of the State or users of those waters resulting from any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order. Reasonable steps shall include such accelerated or additional monitoring as necessary to determine the nature and impact of the non-complying discharge or sludge use or disposal.
- g. The Discharger shall ensure compliance with any existing or future pretreatment standard promulgated by USEPA under section 307 of the CWA, or amendment thereto, for any discharge to the municipal system.
- h. A copy of this Order shall be maintained at the discharge facility and be available at all times to operating personnel. Key operating personnel shall be familiar with its content.

- i. Safeguard to electric power failure:
 - i. The Discharger shall provide safeguards to assure that, should there be reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the discharge shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order.
 - ii. Upon written request by the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a written description of safeguards. Such safeguards may include alternate power sources, standby generators, retention capacity, operating procedures, or other means. A description of the safeguards provided shall include an analysis of the frequency, duration, and impact of power failures experienced over the past 5 years on effluent quality and on the capability of the Discharger to comply with the terms and conditions of the Order. The adequacy of the safeguards is subject to the approval of the Central Valley Water Board.
 - iii. Should the treatment works not include safeguards against reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, or should the Central Valley Water Board not approve the existing safeguards, the Discharger shall, within 90 days of having been advised in writing by the Central Valley Water Board that the existing safeguards are inadequate, provide to the Central Valley Water Board and USEPA a schedule of compliance for providing safeguards such that in the event of reduction, loss, or failure of electric power, the Discharger shall comply with the terms and conditions of this Order. The schedule of compliance shall, upon approval of the Central Valley Water Board, become a condition of this Order.
- j. The Discharger, upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, shall file with the Board a technical report on its preventive (failsafe) and contingency (cleanup) plans for controlling accidental discharges, and for minimizing the effect of such events. This report may be combined with that required under the Central Valley Water Board Standard Provision contained in section VI.A.2.i of this Order.

The technical report shall:

- i. Identify the possible sources of spills, leaks, untreated waste by-pass, and contaminated drainage. Loading and storage areas, power outage, waste treatment unit outage, and failure of process equipment, tanks and pipes should be considered.
- ii. Evaluate the effectiveness of present facilities and procedures and state when they became operational.
- iii. Predict the effectiveness of the proposed facilities and procedures and provide an implementation schedule containing interim and final dates when they will be constructed, implemented, or operational.

The Central Valley Water Board, after review of the technical report, may establish conditions which it deems necessary to control accidental discharges and to minimize the effects of such events. Such conditions shall be incorporated as part of this Order, upon notice to the Discharger.

- k. A publicly owned treatment works whose waste flow has been increasing, or is projected to increase, shall estimate when flows will reach hydraulic and treatment capacities of its treatment and disposal facilities. The projections shall be made in January, based on the last 3 years' average dry weather flows, peak wet weather flows, and total annual flows, as appropriate. When any projection shows that

capacity of any part of the facilities may be exceeded in 4 years, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by 31 January. A copy of the notification shall be sent to appropriate local elected officials, local permitting agencies and the press. Within 120 days of the notification, the Discharger shall submit a technical report showing how it will prevent flow volumes from exceeding capacity or how it will increase capacity to handle the larger flows. The Central Valley Water Board may extend the time for submitting the report.

- I. The Discharger shall submit technical reports as directed by the Executive Officer. All technical reports required herein that involve planning, investigation, evaluation, or design, or other work requiring interpretation and proper application of engineering or geologic sciences, shall be prepared by or under the direction of persons registered to practice in California pursuant to California Business and Professions Code, sections 6735, 7835, and 7835.1. To demonstrate compliance with Title 16, CCR, sections 415 and 3065, all technical reports must contain a statement of the qualifications of the responsible registered professional(s). As required by these laws, completed technical reports must bear the signature(s) and seal(s) of the registered professional(s) in a manner such that all work can be clearly attributed to the professional responsible for the work.
- m. The Central Valley Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.
- n. For publicly owned treatment works, prior to making any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that results in a permanent decrease of flow in any portion of a watercourse, the Discharger must file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for such a change. (Water Code section 1211).
- o. In the event the Discharger does not comply or will be unable to comply for any reason, with any prohibition, maximum daily effluent limitation, 1-hour average effluent limitation, or receiving water limitation contained in this Order, the Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by telephone (916) 464-3291 within 24 hours of having knowledge of such noncompliance, and shall confirm this notification in writing within 5 days, unless the Central Valley Water Board waives confirmation. The written notification shall include the information required by the Standard Provision contained in Attachment D section V.E.1. [40 CFR 122.41(l)(6)(i)].
- p. Failure to comply with provisions or requirements of this Order, or violation of other applicable laws or regulations governing discharges from this facility, may subject the Discharger to administrative or civil liabilities, criminal penalties, and/or other enforcement remedies to ensure compliance. Additionally, certain violations may subject the Discharger to civil or criminal enforcement from appropriate local, state, or federal law enforcement entities.

B. Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP) Requirements

The Discharger shall comply with the MRP and future revisions thereto, in Attachment E.

C. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

- a. Conditions that necessitate a major modification of a permit are described in 40 CFR 122.62, including, but not limited to:

- i. If new or amended applicable water quality standards are promulgated or approved pursuant to section 303 of the CWA, or amendments thereto, this permit may be reopened and modified in accordance with the new or amended standards.
 - ii. When new information, that was not available at the time of permit issuance, would have justified different permit conditions at the time of issuance.
 - b. **Mercury.** If mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted, this Order shall be reopened and the mass effluent limitation modified (higher or lower) or an effluent concentration limitation imposed. If the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for Dischargers subject to a NPDES permit, then this Order may be reopened to reevaluate the mercury mass loading limitation(s) and the need for a mercury offset program for the Discharger.
 - c. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** As a result of a Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE), this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if the State Water Board revises the SIP's toxicity control provisions that would require the establishment of numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitation based on the new provisions.
 - d. **Water Effects Ratios (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating criteria for applicable inorganic constituents, with the exception of copper which uses a site-specific WER of 6.34. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.
 - e. **Ultraviolet (UV) Disinfection Operating Specifications.** The UV operating specifications in this Order are based on the UV guidelines developed by the National Water Research Institute and American Water Works Association Research Foundation titled, "Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse." If the Discharger conducts a site-specific UV Engineering study that identifies site-specific UV operating specifications that will achieve the virus inactivation equivalent to Title 22 disinfected tertiary recycled water, this Order may be reopened to modify the UV operating specifications.
 - f. **Drinking Water Policy.** On 26 July 2013 the Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution No. R5-2013-0098 amending the Basin Plan and establishing a Drinking Water Policy. The State Water Board will consider adoption of the Drinking Water Policy at a future meeting. This Order may be reopened to incorporate monitoring of drinking water constituents to implement the Drinking Water Policy.
2. **Special Studies, Technical Reports and Additional Monitoring Requirements**
 - a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity.** For compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct chronic whole effluent toxicity (WET) testing, as specified in MRP section V. Furthermore, this Provision requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge exceeds the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring established in

this Provision, the Discharger is required to initiate a TRE in accordance with an approved TRE Work Plan, and take actions to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent recurrence of toxicity. A TRE is a site specific study conducted in a stepwise process to identify the source(s) of toxicity and the effective control measures for effluent toxicity. TREs are designed to identify the causative agents and sources of whole effluent toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of the toxicity control options, and confirm the reduction in effluent toxicity. This provision includes procedures for accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring and TRE initiation.

- i. **Accelerated Monitoring and TRE Initiation.** When the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity monitoring, and the testing meets all test acceptability criteria, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring as required in the Accelerated Monitoring Specifications. The Discharger shall initiate a TRE to address effluent toxicity if any WET testing results exceed the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring.
- ii. **Numeric Toxicity Monitoring Trigger.** The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger to initiate a TRE is $> 1 \text{ TUc}$ (where $\text{TUc} = 100/\text{NOEC}$). The monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to begin accelerated monitoring and initiate a TRE.
- iii. **Accelerated Monitoring Specifications.** If the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is exceeded during regular chronic toxicity testing, the Discharger shall initiate accelerated monitoring within 14-days of notification by the laboratory of the exceedance. Accelerated monitoring shall consist of four chronic toxicity tests conducted once every two weeks using the species that exhibited toxicity. The following protocol shall be used for accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation:
 - (a) If the results of four consecutive accelerated monitoring tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring. However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of effluent toxicity, the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.
 - (b) If the source(s) of the toxicity is easily identified (e.g., temporary plant upset), the Discharger shall make necessary corrections to the facility and shall continue accelerated monitoring until four consecutive accelerated tests do not exceed the monitoring trigger. Upon confirmation that the effluent toxicity has been removed, the Discharger may cease accelerated monitoring and resume regular chronic toxicity monitoring.
 - (c) If the result of any accelerated toxicity test exceeds the monitoring trigger, the Discharger shall cease accelerated monitoring and begin a TRE to investigate the cause(s) of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. Within thirty (30) days of notification by the laboratory of any test result exceeding the monitoring trigger during accelerated monitoring, the Discharger shall submit a TRE Action Plan to the Central Valley Water Board including, at minimum:
 - (1) Specific actions the Discharger will take to investigate and identify the cause(s) of toxicity, including a TRE WET monitoring schedule;

- (2) Specific actions the Discharger will take to mitigate the impact of the discharge and prevent the recurrence of toxicity; and
- (3) A schedule for these actions.

Within sixty (60) days of notification by the laboratory of the test results, the Discharger shall submit to the Central Valley Water Board a TRE Workplan for approval by the Executive Officer. The TRE Workplan shall outline the procedures for identifying the source(s) of, and reducing or eliminating effluent toxicity. The TRE Workplan must be developed in accordance with USEPA guidance¹.

3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** The Discharger shall continue to implement their 23 July 2009 Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan to address sources of salinity from the municipal wastewater treatment system. Progress reports shall be submitted annually in January.

4. Construction, Operation and Maintenance Specifications

- a. **Filtration System Operating Specifications.** To ensure the filtration system is operating properly to provide adequate disinfection of the wastewater, the turbidity of the filter effluent measured at Monitoring Location FIL-001 shall not exceed:
 - i. 2 NTUs as a daily average;
 - ii. 5 NTUs more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period; and
 - iii. 10 NTUs, at any time.
- b. **Ultraviolet Light (UV) Disinfection System Operating Specifications.** The UV disinfection system shall apply a minimum UV dose per channel of 100 millijoules per square centimeter (mJ/cm^2) at peak daily flow, unless otherwise approved by the California Department of Public Health (DPH) and shall maintain an adequate dose for disinfection while discharging to Auburn Ravine, unless otherwise approved by DPH or Executive Officer. The Discharger shall provide continuous, reliable monitoring of flow, UV transmittance, and turbidity.
 - i. The Discharger shall operate the treatment system to insure that turbidity prior to disinfection shall not exceed 2 NTU as a daily average, and 5 NTU more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period, and 10 NTU, at any time.
 - ii. The UV transmittance (at 254 nanometers) in the wastewater exiting the UV disinfection system shall not fall below 55 percent of maximum at any time.
 - iii. The quartz sleeves and cleaning system components must be visually inspected per the manufacturer's operations manual for physical wear (scoring, solarization, seal leaks, cleaning fluid levels, etc.) and to check the efficacy of the cleaning system.
 - iv. The lamp sleeves must be cleaned periodically as necessary to meet the requirements.
 - v. Lamps must be replaced per the manufacturer's operations manual, or sooner, if there are indications the lamps are failing to provide adequate disinfection. Lamp age and lamp replacement records must be maintained.

- vi. The Facility must be operated in accordance with an operations and maintenance program that assures adequate disinfection.

c. Treatment Pond Operating Requirements

- i. The treatment facilities shall be designed, constructed, operated, and maintained to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with a 100-year return frequency.
- ii. Public contact with wastewater shall be precluded through such means as fences, signs, and other acceptable alternatives.
- iii. Ponds shall be managed to prevent breeding of mosquitoes. In particular,
 - (a) An erosion control program should assure that small coves and irregularities are not created around the perimeter of the water surface.
 - (b) Weeds shall be minimized.
 - (c) Dead algae, vegetation, and debris shall not accumulate on the water surface.
- iv. Freeboard shall never be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
- v. Ponds shall have sufficient capacity to accommodate allowable wastewater flow and design seasonal precipitation and ancillary inflow and infiltration during the non-irrigation season. Design seasonal precipitation shall be based on total annual precipitation using a return period of 100 years, distributed monthly in accordance with historical rainfall patterns. Freeboard shall never be less than 2 feet (measured vertically to the lowest point of overflow).
- vi. The discharge of waste classified as "hazardous" as defined in section 2521(a) of Title 23, California Code of Regulations (CCR), or "designated", as defined in section 13173 of the Water Code, to the treatment ponds is prohibited.
- vii. Objectionable odors originating at this Facility shall not be perceivable beyond the limits of the wastewater treatment and disposal areas (or property owned by the Discharger).

5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)

a. Pretreatment Requirements

- i. Upon increases of the average dry weather flow above 4.2 MGD (Section IV.A.1.c.ii) and completion of the regionalization project with the Placer County Sewer Maintenance District 1 (SMD1) Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), the Discharger shall implement its pretreatment program and the program shall be an enforceable condition of this Order.
- ii. The Discharger shall be responsible and liable for the performance of all Control Authority pretreatment requirements contained in 40 CFR Part 403, including any subsequent regulatory revisions to 40 CFR Part 403. Where 40 CFR Part 403 or subsequent revision places mandatory actions upon the Discharger as Control Authority but does not specify a timetable for completion of the actions, the Discharger shall complete the required actions within 6 months from the issuance date of this permit or the effective date of the 40 CFR Part 403 revisions, whichever comes later. For violations of pretreatment requirements, the Discharger shall be subject to enforcement actions, penalties, fines, and other remedies by USEPA or other appropriate

- parties, as provided in the CWA. USEPA may initiate enforcement action against a nondomestic user for noncompliance with applicable standards and requirements as provided in the CWA.
- iii. The Discharger shall enforce the requirements promulgated under sections 307(b), 307(c), 307(d), and 402(b) of the CWA with timely, appropriate and effective enforcement actions. The Discharger shall cause all nondomestic users subject to federal categorical standards to achieve compliance no later than the date specified in those requirements or, in the case of a new nondomestic user, upon commencement of the discharge.
 - iv. The Discharger shall perform the pretreatment functions as required in 40 CFR Part 403 including, but not limited to:
 - (a) Implement the necessary legal authorities as provided in 40 CFR 403.8(f)(1);
 - (b) Enforce the pretreatment requirements under 40 CFR 403.5 and 403.6;
 - (c) Implement the programmatic functions as provided in 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2); and
 - (d) Provide the requisite funding and personnel to implement the pretreatment program as provided in 40 CFR 403.8(f)(3).
 - v. The Discharger shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 CFR 403.5, the necessary legal authorities, programs, and controls to ensure that the following incompatible wastes are not introduced to the treatment system, where incompatible wastes are:
 - (a) Wastes which create a fire or explosion hazard in the treatment works;
 - (b) Wastes which will cause corrosive structural damage to treatment works, but in no case wastes with a pH lower than 5.0, unless the works is specially designed to accommodate such wastes;
 - (c) Solid or viscous wastes in amounts which cause obstruction to flow in sewers, or which cause other interference with proper operation or treatment works;
 - (d) Any waste, including oxygen demanding pollutants (BOD, etc.), released in such volume or strength as to cause inhibition or disruption in the treatment works, and subsequent treatment process upset and loss of treatment efficiency;
 - (e) Heat in amounts that inhibit or disrupt biological activity in the treatment works, or that raise influent temperatures above 40°C (104°F), unless the Central Valley Water Board approves alternate temperature limits;
 - (f) Petroleum oil, non-biodegradable cutting oil, or products of mineral oil origin in amounts that will cause interference or pass through;
 - (g) Pollutants which result in the presence of toxic gases, vapors, or fumes within the treatment works in a quantity that may cause acute worker health and safety problems; and
 - (h) Any trucked or hauled pollutants, except at points predesignated by the Discharger.

- vi. The Discharger shall implement, as more completely set forth in 40 CFR 403.5, the legal authorities, programs, and controls necessary to ensure that indirect discharges do not introduce pollutants into the sewerage system that, either alone or in conjunction with a discharge or discharges from other sources:
 - (a) Flow through the system to the receiving water in quantities or concentrations that cause a violation of this Order, or:
 - (b) Inhibit or disrupt treatment processes, treatment system operations, or sludge processes, use, or disposal and either cause a violation of this Order or prevent sludge use or disposal in accordance with this Order.

b. **Sludge/Biosolids Treatment or Discharge Specifications.** Sludge in this document means the solid, semisolid, and liquid residues removed during primary, secondary, or advanced wastewater treatment processes. Solid waste refers to grit and screening material generated during preliminary treatment. Residual sludge means sewage that will not be subject to further treatment at the wastewater treatment plant. Sewage sludge refer to sewage that has been treated and tested and shown to be capable of being beneficially and legally used pursuant to federal and state regulations as a soil amendment for agricultural, silvicultural, horticultural, and land reclamation activities as specified under 40 CFR Part 503.

- i. Collected screenings, residual sludge, sewage sludge, and other solids removed from liquid wastes shall be disposed of in a manner approved by the Executive Officer, and consistent with Consolidated Regulations for Treatment, Storage, Processing, or Disposal of Solid Waste, as set forth in Title 27, CCR, division 2, subdivision 1, section 20005, et seq. Removal for further treatment, storage, disposal, or reuse at sites (e.g., landfill, composting sites, soil amendment sites) that are operated in accordance with valid waste discharge requirements issued by a Regional Water Board will satisfy these specifications.

Sludge and solid waste shall be removed from screens, sumps, ponds, clarifiers, etc. as needed to ensure optimal plant performance.

The treatment of sludge generated at the Facility shall be confined to the Facility property and conducted in a manner that precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate groundwater limitations in section V.B. of this Order. In addition, the storage of residual sludge, solid waste, and sewage sludge on Facility property shall be temporary and controlled, and contained in a manner that minimizes leachate formation and precludes infiltration of waste constituents into soils in a mass or concentration that will violate groundwater limitations included in section V.B. of this Order.

- ii. The use, disposal, storage, and transportation of sewage sludge shall comply with existing federal and state laws and regulations, including permitting requirements and technical standards included in 40 CFR Part 503. If the State Water Board and the Central Valley Water Board are given the authority to implement regulations contained in 40 CFR Part 503, this Order may be reopened to incorporate appropriate time schedules and technical standards. The Discharger must comply with the standards and time schedules contained in 40 CFR Part 503 whether or not they have been incorporated into this Order.
- iii. The Discharger shall comply with Section IX.A. Sewage sludge of the Monitoring and Reporting Program, Attachment E.

- iv. Any proposed change in sewage sludge use or disposal practice from a previously approved practice shall be reported to the Executive Officer and USEPA Regional Administrator at least **90 days** in advance of the change.
- v. **By 25 September 2014**, the Discharger shall submit a sewage sludge use or disposal plan to the Central Valley Water Board or implement an existing plan previously submitted to the board. The plan shall describe at a minimum:
 - (a) Sources and amounts of sewage sludge generated annually.
 - (b) Location(s) of on-site storage and description of the containment area.
 - (c) Plans for ultimate disposal. For landfill disposal, include the present classification of the landfill and the name and location of the landfill.
- c. **Collection System.** On 2 May 2006, the State Water Board adopted State Water Board Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ, Statewide General WDRs for Sanitary Sewer Systems. The Discharger shall be subject to the requirements of Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ and any future revisions thereto. Order No. 2006-0003-DWQ requires that all public agencies that currently own or operate sanitary sewer systems apply for coverage under the general WDRs. The Discharger has applied for and has been approved for coverage under Order 2006-0003-DWQ for operation of its wastewater collection system.
- d. Limited portions of the wastewater collection system may be outside the service area of the Discharger. In order to assure compliance with Discharge Prohibitions against overflows and bypasses, and to assure protection of the entire collection system and treatment works from industrial discharges, it is necessary that the Discharger control discharges into the system. To control discharges into the entire collection system, the Discharger shall establish interagency agreements with the collection system users. The interagency agreements shall contain, at a minimum, requirements for implementation of an industrial pretreatment program that meets the minimum requirements of this permit. The Discharger shall comply with the following time schedule:

<u>Task</u>	<u>Compliance Date</u>
i. Submit interagency agreements for existing connections	27 June 2014
ii. Submit interagency agreements for new connections	30 days prior to connection

6. Other Special Provisions

- a. Wastewater shall be oxidized, coagulated, filtered, and adequately disinfected pursuant to the DPH reclamation criteria, CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 3, (Title 22), or equivalent.
- b. **Facility Expansion**
 - i. **Facility Improvements.** Within 60 days after completion of each individual wastewater treatment plant expansion project to increase the Facility average dry weather flow, the Discharger shall submit a report to the Central Valley Water Board documenting the increase in Facility tertiary treatment capacity. The report shall be certified by a registered and licensed Civil Engineer that the Facility has appropriate tertiary treatment capacity to the new design flow rate.
 - ii. **Request for Increase.** The Discharger shall submit a request for an increase in the permitted flow rate. The increase in the permitted discharge flow rate

shall not be effective until the Executive Officer approves the Discharger's request.

7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

VII. COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION

A. BOD₅ and TSS Effluent Limitations (Sections IV.A.1.a, IV.A.2.a, and IV.A.2.b.).

Compliance with the final effluent limitations for BOD₅ and TSS required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements sections IV.A.1.a. and IV.A.2.a shall be ascertained by 24-hour composite samples. Compliance with effluent limitations required in Limitations and Discharge Requirements section IV.A.2.b. for percent removal shall be calculated using the arithmetic mean of BOD₅ and TSS in effluent samples collected over a monthly period as a percentage of the arithmetic mean of the values for influent samples collected at approximately the same times during the same period.

B. Total Mercury Mass Loading Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.2.e). The procedures for calculating mass loadings are as follows:

1. The total pollutant mass load for each individual calendar month shall be determined using an average of all concentration data collected that month and the corresponding total monthly flow. All effluent monitoring data collected within one calendar month during the quarterly monitoring requirement specified in the monitoring and reporting program, or under the pretreatment program, and any special studies shall be used for these calculations.
2. In calculating compliance, the Discharger shall count all non-detect measures at one-half of the detection level. If compliance with the effluent limitation is not attained due to the non-detect contribution, the Discharger shall improve and implement available analytical capabilities and compliance shall be evaluated with consideration of the detection limits.

C. Average Dry Weather Flow Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.c). The average dry weather discharge flow represents the daily average flow when groundwater is at or near normal and runoff is not occurring. Compliance with the average dry weather flow effluent limitations will be determined annually based on the average daily flow over three consecutive dry weather months (e.g., July, August, and September).

D. Average Daily Discharge Flow Effluent Limitation (Section IV.A.2.d). The average daily discharge flow represents the mean of all daily flow values obtained within a calendar day (i.e., midnight through 11:50 PM).

E. Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations (Section IV.A.1.b). For each day that an effluent sample is collected and analyzed for total coliform organisms, the 7-day median shall be determined by calculating the median concentration of total coliform bacteria in the effluent utilizing the bacteriological results of the last 7 days. For example, if a sample is collected on a Wednesday, the result from that sampling event and all results from the previous 6 days (i.e., Tuesday, Monday, Sunday, Saturday, Friday, and Thursday) are used to calculate the 7-day median. If the 7-day median of total coliform organisms exceeds a most probable number (MPN) of 2.2 per 100 milliliters, the Discharger will be considered out of compliance.

F. Mass Effluent Limitations (Sections IV.A.2.a). The mass effluent limitations contained in the Final Effluent Limitations IV.A.2.a are based on the permitted outfall discharge flow rate and calculated as follows:

$$\text{Mass (lbs/day)} = \text{Flow (MGD)} \times \text{Concentration (mg/L)} \times 8.34 \text{ (conversion factor)}$$

G. Priority Pollutant Effluent Limitations. Compliance with effluent limitations for priority pollutants shall be determined in accordance with Section 2.4.5 of the SIP, as follows:

1. Dischargers shall be deemed out of compliance with an effluent limitation, if the concentration of the priority pollutant in the monitoring sample is greater than the effluent limitation and greater than or equal to the reporting level (RL).
 2. Dischargers shall be required to conduct a Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP) in accordance with section 2.4.5.1 of the SIP when there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and either:
 - a. A sample result is reported as detected, but not quantified (DNQ) and the effluent limitation is less than the RL; or
 - b. A sample result is reported as non-detect (ND) and the effluent limitation is less than the method detection limit (MDL).
 3. When determining compliance with an average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and more than one sample result is available in a month, the discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of DNQ or ND. In those cases, the discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:
 - a. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
 - b. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.
 4. If a sample result, or the arithmetic mean or median of multiple sample results, is below the RL, and there is evidence that the priority pollutant is present in the effluent above an effluent limitation and the discharger conducts a PMP (as described in section 2.4.5.1), the discharger shall not be deemed out of compliance.
- H. Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Effluent Limitation (Section IV.A.2.f.).** Compliance with the accelerated monitoring and TRE provisions of Provision VI.C.2.a shall constitute compliance with the effluent limitation.

ATTACHMENT A – DEFINITIONS

Arithmetic Mean (μ)

Also called the average, is the sum of measured values divided by the number of samples. For ambient water concentrations, the arithmetic mean is calculated as follows:

Arithmetic mean = $\mu = \Sigma x / n$ where: Σx is the sum of the measured ambient water concentrations, and n is the number of samples.

Average Monthly Effluent Limitation (AMEL)

The highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar month, calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar month divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that month.

Average Weekly Effluent Limitation (AWEL)

The highest allowable average of daily discharges over a calendar week (Sunday through Saturday), calculated as the sum of all daily discharges measured during a calendar week divided by the number of daily discharges measured during that week.

Bioaccumulative

Those substances taken up by an organism from its surrounding medium through gill membranes, epithelial tissue, or from food and subsequently concentrated and retained in the body of the organism.

Carcinogenic

Pollutants are substances that are known to cause cancer in living organisms.

Coefficient of Variation (CV)

CV is a measure of the data variability and is calculated as the estimated standard deviation divided by the arithmetic mean of the observed values.

Daily Discharge

Daily Discharge is defined as either: (1) the total mass of the constituent discharged over the calendar day (12:00 am through 11:59 pm) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling (as specified in the permit), for a constituent with limitations expressed in units of mass or; (2) the unweighted arithmetic mean measurement of the constituent over the day for a constituent with limitations expressed in other units of measurement (e.g., concentration).

The daily discharge may be determined by the analytical results of a composite sample taken over the course of one day (a calendar day or other 24-hour period defined as a day) or by the arithmetic mean of analytical results from one or more grab samples taken over the course of the day.

For composite sampling, if 1 day is defined as a 24-hour period other than a calendar day, the analytical result for the 24-hour period will be considered as the result for the calendar day in which the 24-hour period ends.

Detected, but Not Quantified (DNQ)

DNQ are those sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory's MDL. Sample results reported as DNQ are estimated concentrations.

Dilution Credit

Dilution Credit is the amount of dilution granted to a discharge in the calculation of a water quality-based effluent limitation, based on the allowance of a specified mixing zone. It is calculated from the dilution ratio or determined through conducting a mixing zone study or modeling of the discharge and receiving water.

Effluent Concentration Allowance (ECA)

ECA is a value derived from the water quality criterion/objective, dilution credit, and ambient background concentration that is used, in conjunction with the coefficient of variation for the effluent monitoring data, to calculate a long-term average (LTA) discharge concentration. The ECA has the same meaning as waste load allocation (WLA) as used in U.S. EPA guidance (Technical Support Document For Water Quality-based Toxics Control, March 1991, second printing, EPA/505/2-90-001).

Enclosed Bays

Enclosed Bays means indentations along the coast that enclose an area of oceanic water within distinct headlands or harbor works. Enclosed bays include all bays where the narrowest distance between the headlands or outermost harbor works is less than 75 percent of the greatest dimension of the enclosed portion of the bay. Enclosed bays include, but are not limited to, Humboldt Bay, Bodega Harbor, Tomales Bay, Drake's Estero, San Francisco Bay, Morro Bay, Los Angeles-Long Beach Harbor, Upper and Lower Newport Bay, Mission Bay, and San Diego Bay. Enclosed bays do not include inland surface waters or ocean waters.

Estimated Chemical Concentration

The estimated chemical concentration that results from the confirmed detection of the substance by the analytical method below the ML value.

Estuaries

Estuaries means waters, including coastal lagoons, located at the mouths of streams that serve as areas of mixing for fresh and ocean waters. Coastal lagoons and mouths of streams that are temporarily separated from the ocean by sandbars shall be considered estuaries. Estuarine waters shall be considered to extend from a bay or the open ocean to a point upstream where there is no significant mixing of fresh water and seawater. Estuarine waters included, but are not limited to, the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, as defined in Water Code section 12220, Suisun Bay, Carquinez Strait downstream to the Carquinez Bridge, and appropriate areas of the Smith, Mad, Eel, Noyo, Russian, Klamath, San Diego, and Otay rivers. Estuaries do not include inland surface waters or ocean waters.

Inland Surface Waters

All surface waters of the state that do not include the ocean, enclosed bays, or estuaries.

Instantaneous Maximum Effluent Limitation

The highest allowable value for any single grab sample or aliquot (i.e., each grab sample or aliquot is independently compared to the instantaneous maximum limitation).

Instantaneous Minimum Effluent Limitation

The lowest allowable value for any single grab sample or aliquot (i.e., each grab sample or aliquot is independently compared to the instantaneous minimum limitation).

Maximum Daily Effluent Limitation (MDEL)

The highest allowable daily discharge of a pollutant, over a calendar day (or 24-hour period). For pollutants with limitations expressed in units of mass, the daily discharge is calculated as the total mass of the pollutant discharged over the day. For pollutants with limitations expressed in other units of measurement, the daily discharge is calculated as the arithmetic mean measurement of the pollutant over the day.

Median

The middle measurement in a set of data. The median of a set of data is found by first arranging the measurements in order of magnitude (either increasing or decreasing order). If the number of

measurements (n) is odd, then the median = $X_{(n+1)/2}$. If n is even, then the median = $(X_{n/2} + X_{(n/2)+1})/2$ (i.e., the midpoint between the n/2 and n/2+1).

Method Detection Limit (MDL)

MDL is the minimum concentration of a substance that can be measured and reported with 99 percent confidence that the analyte concentration is greater than zero, as defined in 40 C.F.R. part 136, Attachment B, revised as of July 3, 1999.

Minimum Level (ML)

ML is the concentration at which the entire analytical system must give a recognizable signal and acceptable calibration point. The ML is the concentration in a sample that is equivalent to the concentration of the lowest calibration standard analyzed by a specific analytical procedure, assuming that all the method specified sample weights, volumes, and processing steps have been followed.

Mixing Zone

Mixing Zone is a limited volume of receiving water that is allocated for mixing with a wastewater discharge where water quality criteria can be exceeded without causing adverse effects to the overall water body.

Not Detected (ND)

Sample results which are less than the laboratory's MDL.

Ocean Waters

The territorial marine waters of the State as defined by California law to the extent these waters are outside of enclosed bays, estuaries, and coastal lagoons. Discharges to ocean waters are regulated in accordance with the State Water Board's California Ocean Plan.

Persistent Pollutants

Persistent pollutants are substances for which degradation or decomposition in the environment is nonexistent or very slow.

Pollutant Minimization Program (PMP)

PMP means waste minimization and pollution prevention actions that include, but are not limited to, product substitution, waste stream recycling, alternative waste management methods, and education of the public and businesses. The goal of the PMP shall be to reduce all potential sources of a priority pollutant(s) through pollutant minimization (control) strategies, including pollution prevention measures as appropriate, to maintain the effluent concentration at or below the water quality-based effluent limitation. Pollution prevention measures may be particularly appropriate for persistent bioaccumulative priority pollutants where there is evidence that beneficial uses are being impacted. The Central Valley Water Board may consider cost effectiveness when establishing the requirements of a PMP. The completion and implementation of a Pollution Prevention Plan, if required pursuant to Water Code section 13263.3(d), shall be considered to fulfill the PMP requirements.

Pollution Prevention

Pollution Prevention means any action that causes a net reduction in the use or generation of a hazardous substance or other pollutant that is discharged into water and includes, but is not limited to, input change, operational improvement, production process change, and product reformulation (as defined in Water Code section 13263.3). Pollution prevention does not include actions that merely shift a pollutant in wastewater from one environmental medium to another environmental medium, unless clear environmental benefits of such an approach are identified to the satisfaction of the State Water Resources Control Board (State Water Board) or Central Valley Water Board.

Satellite Collection System

The portion, if any, of a sanitary sewer system owned or operated by a different public agency than the agency that owns and operates the wastewater treatment facility that a sanitary sewer system is tributary to.

Source of Drinking Water

Any water designated as municipal or domestic supply (MUN) in a Central Valley Water Board Basin Plan.

Standard Deviation (σ)

Standard Deviation is a measure of variability that is calculated as follows:

$$\sigma = (\sum[(x - \mu)^2]/(n - 1))^{0.5}$$

where:

x is the observed value;


μ is the arithmetic mean of the observed values; and

n is the number of samples.


Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE)

TRE is a study conducted in a step-wise process designed to identify the causative agents of effluent or ambient toxicity, isolate the sources of toxicity, evaluate the effectiveness of toxicity control options, and then confirm the reduction in toxicity. The first steps of the TRE consist of the collection of data relevant to the toxicity, including additional toxicity testing, and an evaluation of facility operations and maintenance practices, and best management practices. A Toxicity Identification Evaluation (TIE) may be required as part of the TRE, if appropriate. (A TIE is a set of procedures to identify the specific chemical(s) responsible for toxicity. These procedures are performed in three phases (characterization, identification, and confirmation) using aquatic organism toxicity tests.)

ATTACHMENT B – MAP



ATTACHMENT C – FLOW SCHEMATIC



ATTACHMENT D – STANDARD PROVISIONS

I. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT COMPLIANCE

A. Duty to Comply

1. The Discharger must comply with all of the conditions of this Order. Any noncompliance constitutes a violation of the Clean Water Act (CWA) and the California Water Code and is grounds for enforcement action, for permit termination, revocation and reissuance, or modification; or denial of a permit renewal application. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a).)
2. The Discharger shall comply with effluent standards or prohibitions established under Section 307(a) of the CWA for toxic pollutants and with standards for sewage sludge use or disposal established under Section 405(d) of the CWA within the time provided in the regulations that establish these standards or prohibitions, even if this Order has not yet been modified to incorporate the requirement. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(a)(1).)

B. Need to Halt or Reduce Activity Not a Defense

It shall not be a defense for a Discharger in an enforcement action that it would have been necessary to halt or reduce the permitted activity in order to maintain compliance with the conditions of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(c).)

C. Duty to Mitigate

The Discharger shall take all reasonable steps to minimize or prevent any discharge or sludge use or disposal in violation of this Order that has a reasonable likelihood of adversely affecting human health or the environment. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(d).)

D. Proper Operation and Maintenance

The Discharger shall at all times properly operate and maintain all facilities and systems of treatment and control (and related appurtenances) which are installed or used by the Discharger to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order. Proper operation and maintenance also includes adequate laboratory controls and appropriate quality assurance procedures. This provision requires the operation of backup or auxiliary facilities or similar systems that are installed by a Discharger only when necessary to achieve compliance with the conditions of this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(e).)

E. Property Rights

1. This Order does not convey any property rights of any sort or any exclusive privileges. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(g).)
2. The issuance of this Order does not authorize any injury to persons or property or invasion of other private rights, or any infringement of state or local law or regulations. (40 C.F.R. § 122.5(c).)

F. Inspection and Entry

The Discharger shall allow the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, U.S. EPA, and/or their authorized representatives (including an authorized contractor acting as their representative), upon the presentation of credentials and other documents, as may be required by law, to (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i); Wat. Code, § 13383):

1. Enter upon the Discharger's premises where a regulated facility or activity is located or conducted, or where records are kept under the conditions of this Order (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(1));

2. Have access to and copy, at reasonable times, any records that must be kept under the conditions of this Order (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(2));
3. Inspect and photograph, at reasonable times, any facilities, equipment (including monitoring and control equipment), practices, or operations regulated or required under this Order (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(3)); and
4. Sample or monitor, at reasonable times, for the purposes of assuring Order compliance or as otherwise authorized by the CWA or the Water Code, any substances or parameters at any location. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(i)(4).)

G. Bypass

1. Definitions
 - a. "Bypass" means the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(i).)
 - b. "Severe property damage" means substantial physical damage to property, damage to the treatment facilities, which causes them to become inoperable, or substantial and permanent loss of natural resources that can reasonably be expected to occur in the absence of a bypass. Severe property damage does not mean economic loss caused by delays in production. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(1)(ii).)
2. Bypass not exceeding limitations. The Discharger may allow any bypass to occur which does not cause exceedances of effluent limitations, but only if it is for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation. These bypasses are not subject to the provisions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3, I.G.4, and I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(2).)
3. Prohibition of bypass. Bypass is prohibited, and the Central Valley Water Board may take enforcement action against a Discharger for bypass, unless (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)):
 - a. Bypass was unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(A));
 - b. There were no feasible alternatives to the bypass, such as the use of auxiliary treatment facilities, retention of untreated wastes, or maintenance during normal periods of equipment downtime. This condition is not satisfied if adequate back-up equipment should have been installed in the exercise of reasonable engineering judgment to prevent a bypass that occurred during normal periods of equipment downtime or preventive maintenance (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(B)); and
 - c. The Discharger submitted notice to the Central Valley Water Board as required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(i)(C).)
4. The Central Valley Water Board may approve an anticipated bypass, after considering its adverse effects, if the Central Valley Water Board determines that it will meet the three conditions listed in Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.G.3 above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(4)(ii).)
5. Notice
 - a. Anticipated bypass. If the Discharger knows in advance of the need for a bypass, it shall submit a notice, if possible at least 10 days before the date of the bypass. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(i).)

- b. Unanticipated bypass. The Discharger shall submit notice of an unanticipated bypass as required in Standard Provisions - Reporting V.E below (24-hour notice). (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(m)(3)(ii).)

H. Upset

Upset means an exceptional incident in which there is unintentional and temporary noncompliance with technology based permit effluent limitations because of factors beyond the reasonable control of the Discharger. An upset does not include noncompliance to the extent caused by operational error, improperly designed treatment facilities, inadequate treatment facilities, lack of preventive maintenance, or careless or improper operation. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(1).)

1. Effect of an upset. An upset constitutes an affirmative defense to an action brought for noncompliance with such technology based permit effluent limitations if the requirements of Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.H.2 below are met. No determination made during administrative review of claims that noncompliance was caused by upset, and before an action for noncompliance, is final administrative action subject to judicial review. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(2).)
2. Conditions necessary for a demonstration of upset. A Discharger who wishes to establish the affirmative defense of upset shall demonstrate, through properly signed, contemporaneous operating logs or other relevant evidence that (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)):
 - a. An upset occurred and that the Discharger can identify the cause(s) of the upset (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(i));
 - b. The permitted facility was, at the time, being properly operated (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(ii));
 - c. The Discharger submitted notice of the upset as required in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.E.2.b below (24-hour notice) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iii)); and
 - d. The Discharger complied with any remedial measures required under Standard Provisions – Permit Compliance I.C above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(3)(iv).)
3. Burden of proof. In any enforcement proceeding, the Discharger seeking to establish the occurrence of an upset has the burden of proof. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(n)(4).)

II. STANDARD PROVISIONS – PERMIT ACTION

A. General

This Order may be modified, revoked and reissued, or terminated for cause. The filing of a request by the Discharger for modification, revocation and reissuance, or termination, or a notification of planned changes or anticipated noncompliance does not stay any Order condition. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(f).)

B. Duty to Reapply

If the Discharger wishes to continue an activity regulated by this Order after the expiration date of this Order, the Discharger must apply for and obtain a new permit. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(b).)

C. Transfers

This Order is not transferable to any person except after notice to the Central Valley Water Board. The Central Valley Water Board may require modification or revocation and reissuance of the Order to change the name of the Discharger and incorporate such other

requirements as may be necessary under the CWA and the Water Code. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(3); § 122.61.)

III. STANDARD PROVISIONS – MONITORING

- A.** Samples and measurements taken for the purpose of monitoring shall be representative of the monitored activity. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(1).)
- B.** Monitoring results must be conducted according to test procedures under 40 C.F.R. part 136 or, in the case of sludge use or disposal, approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136 unless otherwise specified in 40 C.F.R. part 503 unless other test procedures have been specified in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(4); § 122.44(i)(1)(iv).)

IV. STANDARD PROVISIONS – RECORDS

- A.** Except for records of monitoring information required by this Order related to the Discharger's sewage sludge use and disposal activities, which shall be retained for a period of at least five years (or longer as required by 40 C.F.R. part 503), the Discharger shall retain records of all monitoring information, including all calibration and maintenance records and all original strip chart recordings for continuous monitoring instrumentation, copies of all reports required by this Order, and records of all data used to complete the application for this Order, for a period of at least three (3) years from the date of the sample, measurement, report or application. This period may be extended by request of the Central Valley Water Board Executive Officer at any time. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(2).)
- B.** Records of monitoring information shall include:
 - 1. The date, exact place, and time of sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(i));
 - 2. The individual(s) who performed the sampling or measurements (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(ii));
 - 3. The date(s) analyses were performed (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iii));
 - 4. The individual(s) who performed the analyses (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(iv));
 - 5. The analytical techniques or methods used (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(v)); and
 - 6. The results of such analyses. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(j)(3)(vi).)
- C.** Claims of confidentiality for the following information will be denied (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)):
 - 1. The name and address of any permit applicant or Discharger (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(1)); and
 - 2. Permit applications and attachments, permits and effluent data. (40 C.F.R. § 122.7(b)(2).)

V. STANDARD PROVISIONS – REPORTING

A. Duty to Provide Information

The Discharger shall furnish to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA within a reasonable time, any information which the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA may request to determine whether cause exists for modifying, revoking and reissuing, or terminating this Order or to determine compliance with this Order. Upon request, the Discharger shall also furnish to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA copies of records required to be kept by this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(h); Wat. Code, § 13267.)

B. Signatory and Certification Requirements

1. All applications, reports, or information submitted to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, and/or U.S. EPA shall be signed and certified in accordance with Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2, V.B.3, V.B.4, and V.B.5 below. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(k).)
2. All permit applications shall be signed by either a principal executive officer or ranking elected official. For purposes of this provision, a principal executive officer of a federal agency includes: (i) the chief executive officer of the agency, or (ii) a senior executive officer having responsibility for the overall operations of a principal geographic unit of the agency (e.g., Regional Administrators of U.S. EPA). (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(a)(3).)
3. All reports required by this Order and other information requested by the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA shall be signed by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above, or by a duly authorized representative of that person. A person is a duly authorized representative only if:
 - a. The authorization is made in writing by a person described in Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 above (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(1));
 - b. The authorization specifies either an individual or a position having responsibility for the overall operation of the regulated facility or activity such as the position of plant manager, operator of a well or a well field, superintendent, position of equivalent responsibility, or an individual or position having overall responsibility for environmental matters for the company. (A duly authorized representative may thus be either a named individual or any individual occupying a named position.) (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(2)); and
 - c. The written authorization is submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(b)(3).)
4. If an authorization under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above is no longer accurate because a different individual or position has responsibility for the overall operation of the facility, a new authorization satisfying the requirements of Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.3 above must be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and State Water Board prior to or together with any reports, information, or applications, to be signed by an authorized representative. (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(c).)
5. Any person signing a document under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.B.2 or V.B.3 above shall make the following certification:

“I certify under penalty of law that this document and all attachments were prepared under my direction or supervision in accordance with a system designed to assure that qualified personnel properly gather and evaluate the information submitted. Based on my inquiry of the person or persons who manage the system or those persons directly responsible for gathering the information, the information submitted is, to the best of my knowledge and belief, true, accurate, and complete. I am aware that there are significant penalties for submitting false information, including the possibility of fine and imprisonment for knowing violations.” (40 C.F.R. § 122.22(d).)

C. Monitoring Reports

1. Monitoring results shall be reported at the intervals specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E) in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4).)

2. Monitoring results must be reported on a Discharge Monitoring Report (DMR) form or forms provided or specified by the Central Valley Water Board or State Water Board for reporting results of monitoring of sludge use or disposal practices. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(i).)
3. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order using test procedures approved under 40 C.F.R. part 136, or another method required for an industry-specific waste stream under 40 C.F.R. subchapters N or O, the results of such monitoring shall be included in the calculation and reporting of the data submitted in the DMR or sludge reporting form specified by the Central Valley Water Board. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(ii).)
4. Calculations for all limitations, which require averaging of measurements, shall utilize an arithmetic mean unless otherwise specified in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(4)(iii).)

D. Compliance Schedules

Reports of compliance or noncompliance with, or any progress reports on, interim and final requirements contained in any compliance schedule of this Order, shall be submitted no later than 14 days following each schedule date. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(5).)

E. Twenty-Four Hour Reporting

1. The Discharger shall report any noncompliance that may endanger health or the environment. Any information shall be provided orally within 24 hours from the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. A written submission shall also be provided within five (5) days of the time the Discharger becomes aware of the circumstances. The written submission shall contain a description of the noncompliance and its cause; the period of noncompliance, including exact dates and times, and if the noncompliance has not been corrected, the anticipated time it is expected to continue; and steps taken or planned to reduce, eliminate, and prevent reoccurrence of the noncompliance. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(i).)
2. The following shall be included as information that must be reported within 24 hours under this paragraph (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)):
 - a. Any unanticipated bypass that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(A).)
 - b. Any upset that exceeds any effluent limitation in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(ii)(B).)
3. The Central Valley Water Board may waive the above-required written report under this provision on a case-by-case basis if an oral report has been received within 24 hours. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(6)(iii).)

F. Planned Changes

The Discharger shall give notice to the Central Valley Water Board as soon as possible of any planned physical alterations or additions to the permitted facility. Notice is required under this provision only when (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)):

1. The alteration or addition to a permitted facility may meet one of the criteria for determining whether a facility is a new source in section 122.29(b) (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(i)); or
2. The alteration or addition could significantly change the nature or increase the quantity of pollutants discharged. This notification applies to pollutants that are not subject to effluent limitations in this Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(ii).)

3. The alteration or addition results in a significant change in the Discharger's sludge use or disposal practices, and such alteration, addition, or change may justify the application of permit conditions that are different from or absent in the existing permit, including notification of additional use or disposal sites not reported during the permit application process or not reported pursuant to an approved land application plan. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(1)(iii).)

G. Anticipated Noncompliance

The Discharger shall give advance notice to the Central Valley Water Board or State Water Board of any planned changes in the permitted facility or activity that may result in noncompliance with this Order's requirements. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(2).)

H. Other Noncompliance

The Discharger shall report all instances of noncompliance not reported under Standard Provisions – Reporting V.C, V.D, and V.E above at the time monitoring reports are submitted. The reports shall contain the information listed in Standard Provision – Reporting V.E above. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(7).)

I. Other Information

When the Discharger becomes aware that it failed to submit any relevant facts in a permit application, or submitted incorrect information in a permit application or in any report to the Central Valley Water Board, State Water Board, or U.S. EPA, the Discharger shall promptly submit such facts or information. (40 C.F.R. § 122.41(l)(8).)

VI. STANDARD PROVISIONS – ENFORCEMENT

- A. The Central Valley Water Board is authorized to enforce the terms of this permit under several provisions of the Water Code, including, but not limited to, sections 13385, 13386, and 13387.

VII. ADDITIONAL PROVISIONS – NOTIFICATION LEVELS

A. Publicly-Owned Treatment Works (POTWs)

All POTWs shall provide adequate notice to the Central Valley Water Board of the following (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)):

1. Any new introduction of pollutants into the POTW from an indirect discharger that would be subject to sections 301 or 306 of the CWA if it were directly discharging those pollutants (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(1)); and
2. Any substantial change in the volume or character of pollutants being introduced into that POTW by a source introducing pollutants into the POTW at the time of adoption of the Order. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(2).)
3. Adequate notice shall include information on the quality and quantity of effluent introduced into the POTW as well as any anticipated impact of the change on the quantity or quality of effluent to be discharged from the POTW. (40 C.F.R. § 122.42(b)(3).)

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM

Contents

I.	General Monitoring Provisions	E-2
II.	Monitoring Locations	E-3
III.	Influent Monitoring Requirements.....	E-3
	A. Monitoring Location INF-001	E-3
IV.	Effluent Monitoring Requirements	E-4
	A. Filter Clearwell – Internal Monitoring Location INT-001	E-4
	B. Monitoring Location EFF-001	E-4
V.	Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements	E-5
VI.	Land Discharge Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable	E-8
VII.	Recycling Monitoring Requirements – Not Applicable	E-8
VIII.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements	E-8
	A. Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002	E-8
IX.	Other Monitoring Requirements	E-9
X.	Reporting Requirements	E-10
	A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements	E-10
	B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs)	E-10
	C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR's).....	E-13
	D. Other Reports	E-14

Tables

Table E-1.	Monitoring Station Locations	E-3
Table E-2.	Influent Monitoring	E-3
Table E-3.	Effluent Monitoring – Monitoring Location INT-001	E-4
Table E-4.	Effluent Monitoring.....	E-4
Table E-5.	Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series.....	E-6
Table E-6.	Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements.....	E-8
Table E-7.	Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements.....	E-9
Table E-8.	Ultraviolet Light Disinfection System Monitoring Requirements	E-9
Table E-9.	Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule.....	E-11
Table E-10.	Reporting Requirements for Special Provisions Reports.....	E-14

ATTACHMENT E – MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MRP)

The Code of Federal Regulations (40 C.F.R. § 122.48) requires that all NPDES permits specify monitoring and reporting requirements. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 also authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. This MRP establishes monitoring and reporting requirements that implement federal and California regulations.

I. GENERAL MONITORING PROVISIONS

- A.** Samples and measurements taken as required herein shall be representative of the volume and nature of the monitored discharge. All samples shall be taken at the monitoring locations specified below and, unless otherwise specified, before the monitored flow joins or is diluted by any other waste stream, body of water, or substance. Monitoring locations shall not be changed without notification to and the approval of the Central Valley Water Board.
- B.** Effluent samples shall be taken downstream of the last addition of wastes to the treatment or discharge works where a representative sample may be obtained prior to mixing with the receiving waters. Samples shall be collected at such a point and in such a manner to ensure a representative sample of the discharge.
- C.** Chemical, bacteriological, and bioassay analyses of any material required by this Order shall be conducted by a laboratory certified for such analyses by the Department of Public Health (DPH). Laboratories that perform sample analyses must be identified in all monitoring reports submitted to the Central Valley Water Board. In the event a certified laboratory is not available to the Discharger for any onsite field measurements such as pH, DO, turbidity, temperature, and residual chlorine, such analyses performed by a noncertified laboratory will be accepted provided a Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program is instituted by the laboratory. A manual containing the steps followed in this program for any onsite field measurements such as pH, DO, turbidity, temperature, and residual chlorine must be kept onsite in the treatment facility laboratory and shall be available for inspection by Central Valley Water Board staff. The Discharger must demonstrate sufficient capability (qualified and trained employees, properly calibrated and maintained field instruments, etc.) to adequately perform these field measurements. The Quality Assurance-Quality Control Program must conform to USEPA guidelines or to procedures approved by the Central Valley Water Board.
- D.** Appropriate flow measurement devices and methods consistent with accepted scientific practices shall be selected and used to ensure the accuracy and reliability of measurements of the volume of monitored discharges. All monitoring instruments and devices used by the Discharger to fulfill the prescribed monitoring program shall be properly maintained and calibrated as necessary, at least yearly, to ensure their continued accuracy. All flow measurement devices shall be calibrated at least once per year to ensure continued accuracy of the devices.
- E.** Monitoring results, including noncompliance, shall be reported at intervals and in a manner specified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- F.** Laboratories analyzing monitoring samples shall be certified by the DPH, in accordance with the provision of Water Code section 13176, and must include quality assurance/quality control data with their reports.
- G.** The Discharger shall conduct analysis on any sample provided by USEPA as part of the Discharge Monitoring Quality Assurance (DMQA) program. The results of any such analysis shall be submitted to USEPA's DMQA manager.

- H. The Discharger shall file with the Central Valley Water Board technical reports on self-monitoring performed according to the detailed specifications contained in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
- I. The results of all monitoring required by this Order shall be reported to the Central Valley Water Board, and shall be submitted in such a format as to allow direct comparison with the limitations and requirements of this Order. Unless otherwise specified, discharge flows shall be reported in terms of the monthly average and the daily maximum discharge flows.

II. MONITORING LOCATIONS

The Discharger shall establish the following monitoring locations to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitations, discharge specifications, and other requirements in this Order:

Table E-1. Monitoring Station Locations

Discharge Point Name	Monitoring Location Name	Monitoring Location Description
--	INF-001	Composite sampler before the Parshall flume.
--	INT-001	Internal Monitoring Location – Filter Clearwell
001	EFF-001	Downstream from the last connection through which wastes can be admitted into the outfall.
--	RSW-001	In Auburn Ravine Creek, 75 feet upstream from the point of discharge and not influenced by the discharge of effluent.
--	RSW-002	In Auburn Ravine 2,000 feet downstream from the point of discharge.
--	FIL-001	Monitoring of the filter effluent to be measured immediately downstream of the filters prior to the ultraviolet light (UV) disinfection system.
--	UVS-001	A location where a representative sample of wastewater can be collected immediately downstream of the UV disinfection system.
--	BIO-001	Sludge cake from centrifuges.
--	SPL-001	Municipal water supply tap in Operations Control Building.

III. INFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Location INF-001

- 1. The Discharger shall monitor influent to the Facility at Monitoring Location INF-001 as follows:

Table E-2. Influent Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous	--
Conventional Pollutants				
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite ¹	5/Week	²
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite ¹	5/Week	²

¹ 24-hour flow proportional composite.

² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136; or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

IV. EFFLUENT MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Filter Clearwell – Internal Monitoring Location INT-001

- The Discharger shall monitor tertiary treated effluent at Monitoring Location INT-001 as follows. If more than one analytical test method is listed for a given parameter, the Discharger must select from the listed methods and corresponding Minimum Level:

Table E-3. Effluent Monitoring – Monitoring Location INT-001

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Calculate	1/Day	--
Conventional Pollutants				
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite ¹	1/Day	2
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite ¹	1/Day	2
Non-Conventional Pollutants				
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab ³	1/Day	2

¹ 24-hour flow proportional composite.

² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

³ Grab samples shall not be collected at the same time every day.

B. Monitoring Location EFF-001

- The Discharger shall monitor tertiary treated effluent at Monitoring Location EFF-001 as follows during periods of discharge to Auburn Ravine Creek. If more than one analytical test method is listed for a given parameter, the Discharger must select from the listed methods and corresponding Minimum Level:

Table E-4. Effluent Monitoring

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Flow	MGD	Meter	Continuous ¹	--
Conventional Pollutants				
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	24-hr Composite ²	1/Day	3
	lbs/day	Calculate	1/Day	--
pH	standard units	Grab	1/Day ^{4,5}	3
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	24-hr Composite ²	1/Day	3
	lbs/day	Calculate	1/Day	--
Priority Pollutants				
Mercury, Total Recoverable	µg/L	Grab	1/Quarter	3,6,7
Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern	See Attachment I	See Attachment I	See Attachment I	3,6
Non-Conventional Pollutants				
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	Grab	1/Day ^{4,8}	3
	lbs/day	Calculate	1/Day	--
Chlorine, Total Residual	mg/L	Meter	1/Day	3,9
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/Day	3

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Week	³
Hardness (as CaCO ₃)	mg/L	Grab	3/Week ¹⁰	³
Temperature	°C	Grab	1/Day ^{4,5}	³
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	³

¹ The Discharger shall calculate and report the average daily flow for each day. The average daily flow shall be calculated as specified in Section VII.D of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements and reported in the monthly SMRs.

² 24-hour flow proportional composite.

³ Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

⁴ pH and temperature shall be recorded at the time of ammonia sample collection.

⁵ A hand-held field meter may be used, provided the meter utilizes a USEPA-approved algorithm/method and is calibrated and maintained in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions. A calibration and maintenance log for each meter used for monitoring required by this Monitoring and Reporting Program shall be maintained at the Facility.

⁶ For priority pollutant constituents the reporting level shall be consistent with Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (See Attachment I, Table I-1).

⁷ Unfiltered methyl mercury and total mercury samples shall be taken using clean hands/dirty hands procedures, as described in U.S. EPA method 1669: Sampling Ambient Water for Trace Metals at EPA Water Quality Criteria Levels, for collection of equipment blanks (section 9.4.4.2), and shall be analyzed by U.S. EPA method 1630/1631 (Revision E) with a reporting level of 0.05 ng/L for methyl mercury and 0.5 ng/L for total mercury.

⁸ Concurrent with whole effluent toxicity monitoring.

⁹ Monitoring for chlorine residual is only required when chlorine is used in the treatment process. Total chlorine residual must be monitored with a method sensitive to and accurate at a concentration of 0.01 mg/L.

¹⁰ Hardness samples shall be collected concurrently with metals samples.

V. WHOLE EFFLUENT TOXICITY TESTING REQUIREMENTS

A. Acute Toxicity Testing. The Discharger shall conduct acute toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing acute toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger shall meet the following acute toxicity testing requirements:

1. **Monitoring Frequency** – The Discharger shall perform quarterly acute toxicity testing during periods of discharge to Auburn Ravine Creek, concurrent with effluent ammonia sampling. Testing is not required during calendar quarters when no discharge to Auburn Ravine Creek occurs.
2. **Sample Types** – The Discharger may use flow-through or static renewal testing. For static renewal testing, the samples shall be grab samples and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at Monitoring Location EFF-001.
3. **Test Species** – Test species shall be fathead minnows (*Pimephales promelas*).
4. **Methods** – The acute toxicity testing samples shall be analyzed using EPA-821-R-02-012, Fifth Edition. Temperature, total residual chlorine, and pH shall be recorded at the time of sample collection. No pH adjustment may be made unless approved by the Executive Officer.

5. Test Failure – If an acute toxicity test does not meet all test acceptability criteria, as specified in the test method, the Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, not to exceed 7 days following notification of test failure.

B. Chronic Toxicity Testing. The Discharger shall conduct three species chronic toxicity testing to determine whether the effluent is contributing chronic toxicity to the receiving water. The Discharger shall meet the following chronic toxicity testing requirements:

1. Monitoring Frequency – The Discharger shall perform quarterly three species chronic toxicity testing during periods of discharge to Auburn Ravine Creek. Testing is not required during calendar quarters when no discharge to Auburn Ravine Creek occurs.
2. Sample Types – Effluent samples shall be flow proportional 24-hour composites and shall be representative of the volume and quality of the discharge. The effluent samples shall be taken at Monitoring Location EFF-001. The receiving water control shall be a grab sample obtained from Monitoring Location RSW-001, as identified in this Monitoring and Reporting Program.
3. Sample Volumes – Adequate sample volumes shall be collected to provide renewal water to complete the test in the event that the discharge is intermittent.
4. Test Species – Chronic toxicity testing measures sublethal (e.g., reduced growth, reproduction) and/or lethal effects to test organisms exposed to an effluent compared to that of the control organisms. The Discharger shall conduct chronic toxicity tests with:
 - The cladoceran, water flea, *Ceriodaphnia dubia* (survival and reproduction test);
 - The fathead minnow, *Pimephales promelas* (larval survival and growth test); and
 - The green alga, *Selenastrum capricornutum* (growth test).
5. Methods – The presence of chronic toxicity shall be estimated as specified in *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002.
6. Reference Toxicant – As required by the SIP, all chronic toxicity tests shall be conducted with concurrent testing with a reference toxicant and shall be reported with the chronic toxicity test results.
7. Dilutions – For routine and accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, it is not necessary to perform the test using a dilution series. The chronic toxicity testing may be performed using 100% effluent and one control. For Toxicity Reduction Evaluation (TRE) monitoring, the chronic toxicity testing shall be performed using the dilution series identified in Table E-5, below, unless an alternative dilution series is detailed in the submitted TRE Action Plan. A receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

Table E-5. Chronic Toxicity Testing Dilution Series

Sample	Dilutions ^a (%)					Control
	100	75	50	25	12.5	
% Effluent	100	75	50	25	12.5	0
% Control Water	0	25	50	75	87.5	100

^a Receiving water control or laboratory water control may be used as the diluent.

8. **Test Failure** – The Discharger must re-sample and re-test as soon as possible, but no later than fourteen (14) days after receiving notification of a test failure. A test failure is defined as follows:
 - a. The reference toxicant test or the effluent test does not meet all test acceptability criteria as specified in the Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition, EPA/821-R-02-013, October 2002 (Method Manual), and its subsequent amendments or revisions; or
 - b. The percent minimum significant difference (PMSD) measured for the test exceeds the upper PMSD bound variability criterion in Table 6 on page 52 of the Method Manual. (A retest is only required in this case if the test results do not exceed the monitoring trigger specified in the Special Provision at section VI. 2.a.iii. of the Order.)

C. WET Testing Notification Requirements. The Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board within 24-hours after the receipt of test results exceeding the monitoring trigger during regular or accelerated monitoring, or an exceedance of the acute toxicity effluent limitation.

D. WET Testing Reporting Requirements. All toxicity test reports shall include the contracting laboratory's complete report provided to the Discharger and shall be in accordance with the appropriate "Report Preparation and Test Review" sections of the method manuals. At a minimum, whole effluent toxicity monitoring shall be reported as follows:

1. **Chronic WET Reporting.** Regular chronic toxicity monitoring results shall be reported to the Central Valley Water Board within 30 days following completion of the test, and shall contain, at minimum:
 - a. The results expressed in TUC, measured as 100/NOEC, and also measured as 100/LC50, 100/EC25, 100/IC25, and 100/IC50, as appropriate.
 - b. The statistical methods used to calculate endpoints;
 - c. The statistical output page, which includes the calculation of the percent minimum significant difference (PMSD);
 - d. The dates of sample collection and initiation of each toxicity test; and
 - e. The results compared to the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger.

Additionally, the monthly discharger self-monitoring reports shall contain an updated chronology of chronic toxicity test results expressed in TUC, and organized by test species, type of test (survival, growth or reproduction), and monitoring frequency, i.e., either quarterly, monthly, accelerated, or TRE.

2. **Acute WET Reporting.** Acute toxicity test results shall be submitted with the monthly discharger self-monitoring reports and reported as percent survival.
3. **TRE Reporting.** Reports for TREs shall be submitted in accordance with the schedule contained in the Discharger's approved TRE Workplan, or as amended by the Discharger's TRE Action Plan.
4. **Quality Assurance (QA).** The Discharger must provide the following information for QA purposes:
 - a. Results of the applicable reference toxicant data with the statistical output page giving the species, NOEC, LOEC, type of toxicant, dilution water used, concentrations used, PMSD, and dates tested.

- b. The reference toxicant control charts for each endpoint, which include summaries of reference toxicant tests performed by the contracting laboratory.
- c. Any information on deviations or problems encountered and how they were dealt with.

VI. LAND DISCHARGE MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

VII. RECYCLING MONITORING REQUIREMENTS – NOT APPLICABLE

VIII. RECEIVING WATER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002

- 1. When discharging to Auburn Ravine Creek, the Discharger shall monitor Auburn Ravine Creek at Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002 as follows:

Table E-6. Receiving Water Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency ¹	Required Analytical Test Method
Conventional Pollutants				
pH	standard units	Grab	1/Day	²
Priority Pollutants				
Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern	See Attachment I	See Attachment I	See Attachment I ³	2,4
Non-Conventional Pollutants				
Dissolved Oxygen	mg/L	Grab	1/Day	²
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Week	²
Fecal Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	Grab	1/Quarter	²
Hardness, Total (as CaCO ₃)	mg/L	Grab	1/Month	²
Temperature	°F (°C)	Grab	1/Day	²
Turbidity	NTU	Grab	1/Day	²

¹ Receiving water samples shall be collected at Monitoring Location RSW-001 when there is sufficient upstream flow.

² Pollutants shall be analyzed using the analytical methods described in 40 CFR Part 136 or by methods approved by the Central Valley Water Board or the State Water Board.

³ Monitoring required at Monitoring Location RSW-001 only.

⁴ For priority pollutant constituents the reporting level shall be consistent with Sections 2.4.2 and 2.4.3 of the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (See Attachment I, Table I-1).

- 2. In conducting the receiving water sampling, a log shall be kept of the receiving water conditions throughout the reach bounded by Monitoring Locations RSW-001 and RSW-002. Attention shall be given to the presence or absence of:
 - a. Floating or suspended matter;
 - b. Discoloration;
 - c. Bottom deposits;
 - d. Aquatic life;
 - e. Visible films, sheens, or coatings;
 - f. Fungi, slimes, or objectionable growths; and
 - g. Potential nuisance conditions.

Notes on receiving water conditions shall be summarized in the monitoring report.

IX. OTHER MONITORING REQUIREMENTS

A. Sewage sludge

1. Monitoring Location BIO-001

- a. Upon increases of the average dry weather flow above 4.2 MGD (Section IV.A.1.c.ii) and completion of the regionalization project with the Placer County Sewer Maintenance District 1 (SMD1) Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), the Discharger shall collect a composite sample of sludge once per permit term at Monitoring Location BIO-001 in accordance with EPA's *POTW Sludge Sampling and Analysis Guidance Document*, August 1989, and tested for priority pollutants listed in 40 CFR Part 122, Appendix D, Tables II and III (excluding total phenols).
- b. Sewage Sludge monitoring shall be conducted using the methods in *Test Methods for Evaluating Solid Waste, Physical/Chemical Methods* (EPA publication SW-846), as required in 40 CFR 503.8(b)(4). All results must be reported on a 100% dry weight basis. Records of all analyses must state on each page of the laboratory report whether the results are expressed in "100% dry weight" or "as is."
- c. Sampling records shall be retained for a minimum of 5 years. A log shall be maintained of sludge quantities generated and of handling and disposal activities. The frequency of entries is discretionary; however, the log must be complete enough to serve as a basis for part of the annual report.

B. Municipal Water Supply

1 Monitoring Location SPL-001

- a. The Discharger shall monitor the municipal water supply at Monitoring Location SPL-001 as follows.

Table E-7. Municipal Water Supply Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Minimum Sampling Frequency	Required Analytical Test Method
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C ¹	µmhos/cm	Grab	1/Quarter	--
Standard Minerals ²	mg/L	Grab	1/Year	--

¹ If the water supply is from more than one source, the total dissolved solids and electrical conductivity shall be reported as a weighted average and include copies of supporting calculations.

² Standard minerals shall include all major cations and anions and include verification that the analysis is complete (i.e., cation/anion balance).

C. Ultraviolet Light (UV) Disinfection System

1 Monitoring Locations UVS-001 and FIL-001

- a. The Discharger shall monitor the UV disinfection system at Monitoring Locations UVS-001 and FIL-001 as follows:

Table E-8. Ultraviolet Light Disinfection System Monitoring Requirements

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Monitoring Location	Minimum Sampling Frequency
Flow	MGD	Calculate	UVS-001	1/Day ¹
Turbidity	NTU	Meter	FIL-001	Continuous ^{1,2}

Parameter	Units	Sample Type	Monitoring Location	Minimum Sampling Frequency
Number of UV banks in operation	Number	Observation	N/A	Continuous ¹
UV Transmittance	Percent (%)	Meter	UVS-001	Continuous ¹
UV Dose ³	mJ/cm ²	Calculated	UVS-001	Continuous ¹

¹ For continuous analyzers, the Discharger shall report documented routine meter maintenance activities including date, time of day, and duration, in which the analyzer(s) is not in operation. If analyzer(s) fail to provide continuous monitoring for more than two hours and influent and/or effluent from the disinfection process is not diverted for retreatment, the Discharger shall obtain and report hourly manual and/or grab sample results. The Discharger shall not decrease power settings or reduce the number of UV lamp banks in operation while the continuous analyzers are out of service and water is being disinfected.

² Report daily average and maximum turbidity.

³ Report daily minimum hourly average UV dose and daily average UV dose. The minimum hourly average dose shall consist of lowest hourly average dose provided in any channel that had at least one bank of lamps operating during the hour interval. For channels that did not operate for the entire hour interval, the dose will be averaged based on the actual operation time.

X. REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

A. General Monitoring and Reporting Requirements

1. The Discharger shall comply with all Standard Provisions (Attachment D) related to monitoring, reporting, and recordkeeping.
2. Upon written request of the Central Valley Water Board, the Discharger shall submit a summary monitoring report. The report shall contain both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year(s).
3. **Compliance Time Schedules.** For compliance time schedules included in the Order, the Discharger shall submit to the Central Valley Water Board, on or before each compliance due date, the specified document or a written report detailing compliance or noncompliance with the specific date and task. If noncompliance is reported, the Discharger shall state the reasons for noncompliance and include an estimate of the date when the Discharger will be in compliance. The Discharger shall notify the Central Valley Water Board by letter when it returns to compliance with the compliance time schedule.
4. The Discharger shall report to the Central Valley Water Board any toxic chemical release data it reports to the State Emergency Response Commission within 15 days of reporting the data to the Commission pursuant to section 313 of the "*Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act*" of 1986.

B. Self-Monitoring Reports (SMRs)

1. The Discharger shall electronically submit SMRs using the State Water Board's California Integrated Water Quality System (CIWQS) Program Web site (<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/index.html>). The CIWQS Web site will provide additional information for SMR submittal in the event there will be a planned service interruption for electronic submittal.
2. The Discharger shall report in the SMR the results for all monitoring specified in this MRP under sections III through IX. The Discharger shall submit quarterly SMRs including the results of all required monitoring using U.S. EPA-approved test methods or other test methods specified in this Order. SMRs are to include all new monitoring results obtained

since the last SMR was submitted. If the Discharger monitors any pollutant more frequently than required by this Order, the results of this monitoring shall be included in the calculations and reporting of the data submitted in the SMR.

3. Monitoring periods and reporting for all required monitoring shall be completed according to the following schedule:

Table E-9. Monitoring Periods and Reporting Schedule

Sampling Frequency	Monitoring Period Begins On...	Monitoring Period	SMR Due Date
Continuous	Permit effective date	All	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Day	Permit effective date	(Midnight through 11:59 PM) or any 24-hour period that reasonably represents a calendar day for purposes of sampling.	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Week	Permit effective date	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
3/Week	Permit effective date	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
5/Week	Permit effective date	Sunday through Saturday	Submit with monthly SMR
1/Month	Permit effective date	1 st day of calendar month through last day of calendar month	First day of second calendar month following month of sampling.
1/Quarter	Permit effective date	1 January through 31 March 1 April through 30 June 1 July through 30 September 1 October through 31 December	1 May 1 August 1 November 1 February of following year
1/Year	Permit effective date	1 January through 31 December	1 February of following year

4. **Reporting Protocols.** The Discharger shall report with each sample result the applicable Reporting Level (RL) and the current laboratory’s Method Detection Limit (MDL), as determined by the procedure in 40 C.F.R. part 136.

The Discharger shall report the results of analytical determinations for the presence of chemical constituents in a sample using the following reporting protocols:

- a. Sample results greater than or equal to the RL shall be reported as measured by the laboratory (i.e., the measured chemical concentration in the sample).
- b. Sample results less than the RL, but greater than or equal to the laboratory’s MDL, shall be reported as “Detected, but Not Quantified,” or DNQ. The estimated chemical concentration of the sample shall also be reported.

For the purposes of data collection, the laboratory shall write the estimated chemical concentration next to DNQ. The laboratory may, if such information is available, include numerical estimates of the data quality for the reported result. Numerical estimates of data quality may be percent accuracy (\pm a percentage of the reported

- value), numerical ranges (low to high), or any other means considered appropriate by the laboratory.
- c. Sample results less than the laboratory's MDL shall be reported as "Not Detected," or ND.
 - d. Dischargers are to instruct laboratories to establish calibration standards so that the Minimum Level (ML) value (or its equivalent if there is differential treatment of samples relative to calibration standards) is the lowest calibration standard. At no time is the Discharger to use analytical data derived from extrapolation beyond the lowest point of the calibration curve.
5. **Multiple Sample Data.** When determining compliance with an AMEL or MDEL for priority pollutants and more than one sample result is available, the Discharger shall compute the arithmetic mean unless the data set contains one or more reported determinations of "Detected, but Not Quantified" (DNQ) or "Not Detected" (ND). In those cases, the Discharger shall compute the median in place of the arithmetic mean in accordance with the following procedure:
- a. The data set shall be ranked from low to high, ranking the reported ND determinations lowest, DNQ determinations next, followed by quantified values (if any). The order of the individual ND or DNQ determinations is unimportant.
 - b. The median value of the data set shall be determined. If the data set has an odd number of data points, then the median is the middle value. If the data set has an even number of data points, then the median is the average of the two values around the middle unless one or both of the points are ND or DNQ, in which case the median value shall be the lower of the two data points where DNQ is lower than a value and ND is lower than DNQ.
6. The Discharger shall submit SMRs in accordance with the following requirements:
- a. The Discharger shall arrange all reported data in a tabular format. The data shall be summarized to clearly illustrate whether the facility is operating in compliance with interim and/or final effluent limitations. The Discharger is not required to duplicate the submittal of data that is entered in a tabular format within CIWQS. When electronic submittal of data is required and CIWQS does not provide for entry into a tabular format within the system, the Discharger shall electronically submit the data in a tabular format as an attachment.
 - b. The Discharger shall attach a cover letter to the SMR. The information contained in the cover letter shall clearly identify violations of the WDRs; discuss corrective actions taken or planned; and the proposed time schedule for corrective actions. Identified violations must include a description of the requirement that was violated and a description of the violation.
7. The Discharger shall submit in the SMRs calculations and reports in accordance with the following requirements:
- a. **Average Dry Weather Flow.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the average dry weather flow for the effluent at Monitoring Location INT-001. The average dry weather flow shall be calculated as specified in Section VII.C and reported in the December SMR.
 - b. **Mass Loading Limitations.** For BOD₅, TSS, and ammonia, the Discharger shall calculate and report the mass loading (lbs/day) in the SMRs. The mass loading shall be calculated as follows:

$$\text{Mass Loading (lbs/day)} = \text{Flow (MGD)} \times \text{Concentration (mg/L)} \times 8.34$$

When calculating daily mass loading, the daily average flow and constituent concentration shall be used. For weekly average mass loading, the weekly average flow and constituent concentration shall be used. For monthly average mass loading, the monthly average flow and constituent concentration shall be used.

- c. **Removal Efficiency (BOD₅ and TSS).** The Discharger shall calculate and report the percent removal of BOD₅ and TSS in the SMRs. The percent removal shall be calculated as specified in Section VII.A. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.
- d. **Total Coliform Organisms Effluent Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the 7-day median of total coliform organisms for the effluent. The 7-day median of total coliform organisms shall be calculated as specified in Section VII.E. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.
- e. **Monthly Mercury Effluent Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the monthly mercury mass loading for the effluent. The monthly mass loading shall be calculated as specified in Section VII.B. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.
- f. **Dissolved Oxygen Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report monthly in the self-monitoring report: i) the dissolved oxygen concentration, ii) the percent of saturation in the main water mass, and iii) the 95th percentile dissolved oxygen concentration.
- g. **Turbidity Receiving Water Limitations.** The Discharger shall calculate and report the turbidity increase in the receiving water applicable to the natural turbidity condition specified in Section V.A.17.a-b. of the Limitations and Discharge Requirements.

C. Discharge Monitoring Reports (DMR's)

- 1. At any time during the term of this permit, the State Water Board or Central Valley Water Board may notify the Discharger to electronically submit DMR's. Until such notification is given specifically for the submittal of DMR's, the Discharger shall submit DMR's in accordance with the requirements described below.
- 2. DMR's must be signed and certified as required by the standard provisions (Attachment D). The Discharger shall submit the original DMR and one copy of the DMR to the address listed below:

STANDARD MAIL	FEDEX/UPS/ OTHER PRIVATE CARRIERS
State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality c/o DMR Processing Center PO Box 100 Sacramento, CA 95812-1000	State Water Resources Control Board Division of Water Quality c/o DMR Processing Center 1001 I Street, 15 th Floor Sacramento, CA 95814

- 3. All discharge monitoring results must be reported on the official U.S. EPA pre-printed DMR forms (EPA Form 3320-1) or on self-generated forms that follow the exact same format of EPA Form 3320-1.

D. Other Reports

1. **Special Study Reports and Progress Reports.** As specified in the Special Provisions contained in section VI of the Order, special study and progress reports shall be submitted in accordance with the following reporting requirements.

Table E-10. Reporting Requirements for Special Provisions Reports

Special Provision	Reporting Requirements
Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Progress Reports (Provision VI.C.3.a)	1 January, annually
Sewage Sludge Use and Disposal Plan (Provision VI.C.5.b.v)	25 September 2014
Interagency Agreements for Existing Connections (Prov.VI.C.5.d.i)	27 June 2014

2. The Discharger shall report the results of any special studies, acute and chronic toxicity testing, TRE/TIE, PMP, and Pollution Prevention Plan required by Special Provisions VI.C. The Discharger shall submit reports with the first monthly SMR scheduled to be submitted on or immediately following the report due date.
3. Within 60 days of permit adoption, the Discharger shall submit a report outlining reporting levels (RLs), method detection limits, and analytical methods for approval. The Discharger shall comply with the monitoring and reporting requirements for CTR constituents as outlined in section 2.3 and 2.4 of the SIP. The maximum required reporting levels for priority pollutant constituents shall be based on the Minimum Levels (MLs) contained in Appendix 4 of the SIP, determined in accordance with Section 2.4.2 and Section 2.4.3 of the SIP. In accordance with Section 2.4.2 of the SIP, when there is more than one ML value for a given substance, the Central Valley Water Board shall include as RLs, in the permit, all ML values, and their associated analytical methods, listed in Appendix 4 that are below the calculated effluent limitation. The Discharger may select any one of those cited analytical methods for compliance determination. If no ML value is below the effluent limitation, then the Central Valley Water Board shall select as the RL, the lowest ML value, and its associated analytical method, listed in Appendix 4 for inclusion in the permit. Table I-1 (Attachment I) provides required maximum reporting levels in accordance with the SIP.
4. **Annual Operations Report.** By 30 January of each year, the Discharger shall submit a written report to the Executive Officer containing the following:
 - a. The names, certificate grades, and general responsibilities of all persons employed at the Facility.
 - b. The names and telephone numbers of persons to contact regarding the plant for emergency and routine situations.
 - c. A statement certifying when the flow meter(s) and other monitoring instruments and devices were last calibrated, including identification of who performed the calibration.
 - d. A statement certifying whether the current operation and maintenance manual, and contingency plan, reflect the wastewater treatment plant as currently constructed and operated, and the dates when these documents were last revised and last reviewed for adequacy.
 - e. The Discharger may also be requested to submit an annual report to the Central Valley Water Board with both tabular and graphical summaries of the monitoring data obtained during the previous year. Any such request shall be made in writing.

The report shall discuss the compliance record. If violations have occurred, the report shall also discuss the corrective actions taken and planned to bring the discharge into full compliance with the waste discharge requirements.

5. **Annual Pretreatment Reporting Requirements.** Upon completion of the regionalization project with the Placer County Sewer Maintenance District 1 (SMD1) Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP), the Discharger shall submit annually a report to the Central Valley Water Board, with copies to USEPA Region 9 and the State Water Board, describing the Discharger's pretreatment activities over the previous 12 months (1 January through 31 December). In the event that the Discharger is not in compliance with any conditions or requirements of this Order, including noncompliance with pretreatment audit/compliance inspection requirements, then the Discharger shall also include the reasons for noncompliance and state how and when the Discharger shall comply with such conditions and requirements.

An annual report shall be submitted by **28 February** and include at least the following items:

- a. A summary of analytical results from representative, flow proportioned, 24-hour composite sampling of the POTW's influent and effluent for those pollutants USEPA has identified under section 307(a) of the CWA which are known or suspected to be discharged by nondomestic users. This will consist of an annual full priority pollutant scan. The Discharger is not required to sample and analyze for asbestos. The Discharger shall submit the results of the annual priority pollutant scan electronically to the Central Valley Water Board using the State Water Board's CIWQS Program Website.

Sludge shall be sampled during the same 24-hour period and analyzed for the same pollutants as the influent and effluent sampling and analysis. The sludge analyzed shall be a composite sample of a minimum of 12 discrete samples taken at equal time intervals over the 24-hour period. Wastewater and sludge sampling and analysis shall be performed at least annually. The Discharger shall also provide any influent, effluent or sludge monitoring data for nonpriority pollutants which may be causing or contributing to Interference, Pass-Through or adversely impacting sludge quality. Sampling and analysis shall be performed in accordance with the techniques prescribed in 40 CFR Part 136 and amendments thereto.

- b. A discussion of Upset, Interference, or Pass-Through incidents, if any, at the treatment plant, which the Discharger knows or suspects were caused by nondomestic users of the POTW. The discussion shall include the reasons why the incidents occurred, the corrective actions taken and, if known, the name and address of, the nondomestic user(s) responsible. The discussion shall also include a review of the applicable pollutant limitations to determine whether any additional limitations, or changes to existing requirements, may be necessary to prevent Pass-Through, Interference, or noncompliance with sludge disposal requirements.
- c. The cumulative number of nondomestic users that the Discharger has notified regarding Baseline Monitoring Reports and the cumulative number of nondomestic user responses.
- d. An updated list of the Discharger's significant industrial users (SIUs) including their names and addresses, or a list of deletions, additions and SIU name changes keyed to a previously submitted list. The Discharger shall provide a brief explanation for each change. The list shall identify the SIUs subject to federal categorical standards by specifying which set(s) of standards are applicable to each SIU. The list shall

indicate which SIUs, or specific pollutants from each industry, are subject to local limitations. Local limitations that are more stringent than the federal categorical standards shall also be identified.

- e. The Discharger shall characterize the compliance status through the year of record of each SIU by employing the following descriptions:
 - i. complied with baseline monitoring report requirements (where applicable);
 - ii. consistently achieved compliance;
 - iii. inconsistently achieved compliance;
 - iv. significantly violated applicable pretreatment requirements as defined by 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(vii);
 - v. complied with schedule to achieve compliance (include the date final compliance is required);
 - vi. did not achieve compliance and not on a compliance schedule; and
 - vii. compliance status unknown.
- f. A report describing the compliance status of each SIU characterized by the descriptions in items iii through vii above shall be submitted for each calendar quarter by the first day of the second month following the end of the quarter. The report shall identify the specific compliance status of each such SIU and shall also identify the compliance status of the POTW with regards to audit/pretreatment compliance inspection requirements. If none of the aforementioned conditions exist, at a minimum, a letter indicating that all industries are in compliance and no violations or changes to the pretreatment program have occurred during the quarter must be submitted. The information required in the fourth quarter report shall be included as part of the annual report due every 28 February. This quarterly reporting requirement shall commence upon issuance of this Order.
- g. A summary of the inspection and sampling activities conducted by the Discharger during the past year to gather information and data regarding the SIUs. The summary shall include:
 - i. The names and addresses of the SIUs subjected to surveillance and an explanation of whether they were inspected, sampled, or both and the frequency of these activities at each user; and
 - ii. The conclusions or results from the inspection or sampling of each industrial user.
- h. The Discharger shall characterize the compliance status of each SIU by providing a list or table which includes the following information:
 - i. Name of SIU;
 - ii. Category, if subject to federal categorical standards;
 - iii. The type of wastewater treatment or control processes in place;
 - iv. The number of samples taken by the POTW during the year;
 - v. The number of samples taken by the SIU during the year;
 - vi. For an SIU subject to discharge requirements for total toxic organics, whether all required certifications were provided;

- vii. A list of the standards violated during the year. Identify whether the violations were for categorical standards or local limits.
- viii. Whether the facility is in significant noncompliance (SNC) as defined at 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(viii) at any time during the year; and
- ix. A summary of enforcement or other actions taken during the year to return the SIU to compliance. Describe the type of action (e.g., warning letters or notices of violation, administrative orders, civil actions, and criminal actions), final compliance date, and the amount of fines and penalties collected, if any. Describe any proposed actions for bringing the SIU into compliance;
- x. Restriction of flow to the POTW.
- xi. Disconnection from discharge to the POTW.
- i. A brief description of any programs the POTW implements to reduce pollutants from nondomestic users that are not classified as SIUs;
- j. A brief description of any significant changes in operating the pretreatment program which differ from the previous year including, but not limited to, changes concerning: the program's administrative structure, local limits, monitoring program or monitoring frequencies, legal authority, enforcement policy, funding levels, or staffing levels;
- k. A summary of the annual pretreatment budget, including the cost of pretreatment program functions and equipment purchases; and
- l. A summary of activities to involve and inform the public of the program including a copy of the newspaper notice, if any, required under 40 CFR 403.8(f)(2)(viii).

Duplicate signed copies of these Pretreatment Program reports shall be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board and the:

State Water Resources Control Board
Division of Water Quality
1001 I Street or P.O. Box 100
Sacramento, CA 95812

and the

Regional Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency WTR-5
75 Hawthorne Street
San Francisco, CA 94105

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

Contents

I. Permit Information..... F-3

II. Facility Description..... F-4

 A. Description of Wastewater and Sewage sludge Treatment and Controls F-4

 B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters F-5

 C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data F-5

 D. Compliance Summary..... F-6

 E. Planned Changes F-7

III. Applicable Plans, Policies, and Regulations F-7

 A. Legal Authorities F-7

 B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)..... F-8

 C. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans..... F-8

 D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List..... F-10

 E. Other Plans, Polices and Regulations F-11

IV. Rationale For Effluent Limitations and Discharge Specifications F-11

 A. Discharge Prohibitions F-12

 B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations F-13

 1. Scope and Authority F-13

 2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations..... F-13

 C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs) F-15

 1. Scope and Authority F-15

 2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives..... F-16

 3. Determining the Need for WQBELs F-24

 4. WQBEL Calculations F-40

 5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET) F-42

 D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations F-45

 1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations F-45

 2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations F-45

 3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements..... F-46

 4. Antidegradation Policies F-47

 5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants F-48

 E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable F-50

 F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable F-50

 G. Recycling Specifications F-50

V. Rationale for Receiving Water Limitations..... F-51

 A. Surface Water..... F-51

 B. Groundwater..... F-54

VI. Rationale for Provisions F-55

 A. Standard Provisions..... F-55

 B. Special Provisions..... F-55

 1. Reopener Provisions F-55

 2. Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements F-56

 3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention..... F-59

 4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications..... F-59

 5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)..... F-60

 6. Other Special Provisions F-61

 7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable F-61

VII. Rationale for Monitoring and Reporting Requirements F-61

 A. Influent Monitoring F-61

 B. Effluent Monitoring F-62

 C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements F-63

 D. Receiving Water Monitoring F-63

 1. Surface Water F-63

 2. Groundwater – Not Applicable F-64

 E. Other Monitoring Requirements F-64

VIII. Public Participation..... F-64

 A. Notification of Interested Parties F-64

 B. Written Comments F-64

 C. Public Hearing F-65

 D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements F-65

 E. Information and Copying F-65

 F. Register of Interested Persons..... F-65

 G. Additional Information F-65

Tables

Table F-1. Facility Information..... F-3

Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data F-5

Table F-3. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data F-5

Table F-4. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses F-8

Table F-5. 303 (d) List for Sacramento River (Knights Landing to the Delta)..... F-11

Table F-6. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations – Filter Clearwell Internal Waste Stream Compliance Point (Monitoring Location INT-001)..... F-15

Table F-7. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) F-15

Table F-8. Zinc ECA Evaluation..... F-21

Table F-9. Lead ECA Evaluation..... F-23

Table F-10. Lead ECA Evaluation..... F-24

Table F-11. Summary of ECA Evaluations for CTR Hardness-dependent Metals F-24

Table F-12. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations – Filter Clearwell Internal Waste Stream Compliance Point (Monitoring Location INT-001) F-41

Table F-13. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) F-41

Table F-14. Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results F-43

Table F-15. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations – Filter Clearwell Internal Waste Stream Compliance Point (Monitoring Location INT-001) F-49

Table F-16. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) F-50

ATTACHMENT F – FACT SHEET

As described in section I, the Central Valley Water Board incorporates this Fact Sheet as findings of the Central Valley Water Board supporting the issuance of this Order. This Fact Sheet includes the legal requirements and technical rationale that serve as the basis for the requirements of this Order.

This Order has been prepared under a standardized format to accommodate a broad range of discharge requirements for Dischargers in California. Only those sections or subsections of this Order that are specifically identified as “not applicable” have been determined not to apply to this Discharger. Sections or subsections of this Order not specifically identified as “not applicable” are fully applicable to this Discharger.

I. PERMIT INFORMATION

The following table summarizes administrative information related to the facility.

Table F-1. Facility Information

WDID	5A31NP00011
Discharger	City of Lincoln
Name of Facility	Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility
Facility Address	1245 Fiddymment Road
	Lincoln, CA 95648
	Placer County
Facility Contact, Title and Phone	Stephen Gittings, Chief Plant Operator, (916) 773-8100
Authorized Person to Sign and Submit Reports	Michael Kashiwagi, Interwest Consulting, Interim Director of Public Services, (916) 434-2450
Mailing Address	600 Sixth Street, Lincoln, CA 95648
Billing Address	Same as Mailing Address
Type of Facility	Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTW)
Major or Minor Facility	Major
Threat to Water Quality	1
Complexity	A
Pretreatment Program	N
Recycling Requirements	Producer Master Reclamation Permit Order R5-2005-0040-01 (as amended by Order R5-2012-0052)
Facility Permitted Flow	Existing Plant – 4.2 million gallons per day (MGD), average dry weather flow Regionalized Plant – 5.9 MGD, average dry weather flow Expanded Plant – Up to 8.4 MGD, average dry weather flow
Facility Design Flow	Existing Plant – 4.2 MGD, average dry weather flow Regionalized Plant – 5.9 MGD, average dry weather flow Expanded Plant – Up to 8.4 MGD, average dry weather flow
Watershed	Lower Sacramento
Receiving Water	Auburn Ravine Creek
Receiving Water Type	Inland Surface Water

- A. The City of Lincoln (hereinafter Discharger) is the owner and operator of the City of Lincoln, Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility (hereinafter Facility), a POTW. Stantec

Consulting is the contract operator of the Facility.

For the purposes of this Order, references to the “discharger” or “permittee” in applicable federal and state laws, regulations, plans, or policy are held to be equivalent to references to the Discharger herein.

- B.** The Facility discharges wastewater to Auburn Ravine Creek, a water of the United States, tributary to the Sacramento River, via East Side Canal and Natomas Cross Canal, within the Lower Sacramento watershed. The Discharger was previously regulated by Order R5-2008-0156 and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit No. CA0084476 adopted on 23 October 2008 and expired on 23 October 2013. Attachment B provides a map of the area around the Facility. Attachment C provides a flow schematic of the Facility.

Prior to making any change in the point of discharge, place of use, or purpose of use of treated wastewater that results in a decrease of flow in any portion of a watercourse, the Discharger must file a petition with the State Water Board, Division of Water Rights, and receive approval for such a change. The State Water Board retains the jurisdictional authority to enforce such requirements under Water Code section 1211.

- C.** The Discharger filed a report of waste discharge (ROWD) and submitted an application for reissuance of its WDRs and NPDES permit on 26 April 2013. Supplemental information was requested on 12 June 2013 and 24 July 2013 and received on 17 June 2013 and 24 July 2013. The application was deemed complete on 29 April 2013. A site visit was conducted on 4 June 2013, to observe operations and collect additional data to develop permit limitations and requirements for waste discharge.

II. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Discharger provides sewerage service for the City of Lincoln and western Placer County and serves a population of approximately 43,000. The current design daily average dry weather flow capacity of the Facility is 4.2 MGD.

A. Description of Wastewater and Sewage sludge Treatment and Controls

The treatment system consists of screening, oxidation ditches with anoxic zones, secondary clarification, maturation ponds, dissolved air flotation (DAF), coagulation, flocculation, sand filtration, and ultraviolet light (UV) disinfection. Sludge is dewatered using a belt filter press. Dried sludge is hauled to a landfill. The Facility also includes a lined emergency storage basin and two tertiary storage basins.

Tertiary treated effluent is either discharged to Auburn Ravine Creek at Discharge Point 001, or to on-site and off-site reclamation areas (regulated by separate Master Reclamation Permit Order R5-2005-0040-01, as amended by Order R5-2012-0052). The Discharger has the ability to divert tertiary treated effluent to the tertiary storage basins to store recycled water, store final effluent during downstream flood events, and/or to store effluent that does not meet permit requirements (e.g., receiving water temperature limits). Because the Facility is able to temporarily store tertiary treated effluent and discharge it at a later date, there are times when no discharge to surface water at Discharge Point 001 is occurring and there are times when the discharge to surface water exceeds the regulated flow capacity of the treatment works (e.g., flow is being discharged directly from the treatment process and stored, treated effluent is being discharged from the tertiary storage basins). The outfall at Discharge Point 001 possesses a maximum hydraulic capacity of 13 MGD.

B. Discharge Points and Receiving Waters

1. The Facility is located in Sections 29 and 30, T11N, R6E, MDB&M, as shown in Attachment B, a part of this Order.
2. Treated municipal wastewater is discharged at Discharge Point 001 to Auburn Ravine Creek, a water of the United States, and tributary to East Side Canal, Natomas Cross Canal, and the Sacramento River at a point latitude 38° 52' 05" N and longitude 121° 21' 28" W.

C. Summary of Existing Requirements and Self-Monitoring Report (SMR) Data

1. **Filter Clearwell – INT-001.** Effluent limitations contained in Order R5-2008-0156 for discharges from the Filter Clearwell Internal Waste Stream Compliance Point (Monitoring Location INT-001) and representative monitoring data from the term of Order R5-2008-0156 are as follows:

Table F-2. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (December 2008 – March 2013)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Flow	MGD	--	--	4.2	--	--	11
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day at 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	20	4.4	6.7	7.5
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	20	3.6	5.4	14
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	--	2.2 ¹	23 ² /240 ³	--	--	4.0 ⁴

¹ Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.
² Not to be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.
³ Applied as an instantaneous maximum effluent limitation.
⁴ Represents the maximum observed result.

2. **Discharge Point 001.** Effluent limitations contained in Order R5-2008-0156 for discharges from the Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) and representative monitoring data from the term of Order R5-2008-0156 are as follows:

Table F-3. Historic Effluent Limitations and Monitoring Data

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (December 2008 – March 2013)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Flow	MGD	--	--	12.2	--	--	11.6
Biochemical Oxygen	mg/L	30	45	60	4.7	7.0	7.3
	lbs/day	1,050	1,580	2,100	153	232	245

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitation			Monitoring Data (December 2008 – March 2013)		
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Highest Average Monthly Discharge	Highest Average Weekly Discharge	Highest Daily Discharge
Demand (5-day at 20°C)	% Removal	85	--	--	NR	--	--
pH	standard units	--	--	6.5 – 8.5	--	--	5.1 – 8.2
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	30	45	60	4.7	7.8	24
	lbs/day	1,050	1,580	2,100	228	550	1,151
	% Removal	85	--	--	NR	--	--
Aluminum, Total Recoverable	µg/L	200 ¹ /300	--	750	76 ² /150	--	150
Ammonia, Total (as N)	mg/L	0.70	--	2.10	0.18	--	0.58
	lbs/day	24.5	--	73.6	5.8	--	23
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	3.4	--	7.0	9.0	--	15.8
Mercury, Total Recoverable	lbs/month	0.022 ³	--	--	0.0006	--	--
Total Residual Chlorine	mg/L	--	0.011 ⁴	0.019 ⁵	NR	--	NR
Acute Toxicity	% Survival	--	--	70 ⁶ /90 ⁷	--	--	85 ⁸ /100 ⁹
Chronic Toxicity	TUc	--	--	7	--	--	8

NR = Not Reported

¹ Applied as a calendar annual average effluent limitation.

² Represents the maximum observed annual average concentration.

³ The total monthly mass discharge of total mercury discharged to Auburn Ravine Creek not to exceed this value until 1 September 2015. Upon compliance with VI.C.6.b.i, the total cumulative mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.0234 pounds/month for a calendar month.

⁴ Applied as a 4-day average effluent limitation.

⁵ Applied as a 1-hour average effluent limitation.

⁶ Minimum for any one bioassay.

⁷ Median for any three consecutive bioassays.

⁸ Minimum observed bioassay.

⁹ Minimum observed median of three bioassays.

¹⁰ There shall be no chronic toxicity in the effluent discharge.

D. Compliance Summary

1. There were no major violations during the term of Order R5-2008-0156.
2. A compliance and enforcement inspection (CEI) of the Facility was conducted on 19 November 2009. During the course of the inspection, the inspector documented the following adverse findings:
 - a. Order R5-2008-0156, Attachment D, Standard Provisions, Provision V.B.3, requires that all reports shall be signed by a responsible official or a duly authorized representative of that person. The duly authorized representative may be either a

named individual or any individual occupying a named position (V.B.3.b). It was unclear if the Facility representative signing monthly SMRs was a duly authorized representative in accordance with Attachment D, Provision V.B.3.

3. A CEI of the Facility was conducted on 18 January 2012. No adverse findings were observed during the CEI.
4. A CEI of the Facility was conducted on 3 April 2013. During the course of the inspection, the inspector documented the following adverse findings:
 - a. Failure to adequately document method reporting limits (RL) in the Facility's eSMRs; and
 - b. Failure to include a statement certifying when Facility operational documents were last updated or revised, consistent with Section X.D.4.d of Order R5-2008-0156.
5. A CEI of the Facility was conducted on 3 September 2013. No adverse findings were observed during the CEI.

E. Planned Changes

During the term of this Order, the Discharger is planning to expand and upgrade the Facility to increase the design average dry weather flow from 4.2 MGD up to 5.9 MGD to accommodate regionalization with the Placer County Sewer Maintenance District 1 (SMD1) Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). The regionalization project is proposed to be complete by 1 September 2015 in accordance with Cease and Desist Order (CDO) R5-2010-0093-01 for the Placer County SMD1 WWTP. The existing plant capacity will be increased through the addition of the following units:

1. Two influent pumps and additional headworks improvements;
2. One anoxic basin and oxidation ditch complex;
3. Two secondary clarifiers;
4. Modifications to the maturation ponds' effluent structures;
5. Two filter cells;
6. Effluent pumping station improvements.

This Order allows for an increase in the permitted average dry weather flow to 5.9 MGD upon completion of the regionalization project. This Order also allows an increase in the permitted average dry weather flow up to 8.4 MGD (or some smaller increase) to accommodate growth within the Discharger's service area and/or additional regionalization projects.

III. APPLICABLE PLANS, POLICIES, AND REGULATIONS

The requirements contained in this Order are based on the requirements and authorities described in this section.

A. Legal Authorities

This Order serves as WDRs pursuant to article 4, chapter 4, division 7 of the California Water Code (commencing with section 13260). This Order is also issued pursuant to section 402 of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA) and implementing regulations adopted by the U.S. EPA and chapter 5.5, division 7 of the Water Code (commencing with section 13370). It shall serve as an NPDES permit for point source discharges from this facility to surface waters.

B. California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA)

Under Water Code section 13389, this action to adopt an NPDES permit is exempt from the provisions of Chapter 3 of CEQA, (commencing with section 21100) of Division 13 of the Public Resources Code.

C. State and Federal Laws, Regulations, Policies, and Plans

1. **Water Quality Control Plans.** Requirements of this Order specifically implement the applicable Water Quality Control Plans.

a. **Basin Plan.** The Central Valley Water Board adopted a Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition (Revised October 2011), for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins (hereinafter Basin Plan) that designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. Requirements in this Order implement the Basin Plan.

The Basin Plan at II-2.00 states that the beneficial uses of any specifically identified water body generally apply to its tributary streams. The Basin Plan in Table II-1, Section II, does not specifically identify beneficial uses for Auburn Ravine Creek, but does identify present and potential uses for Sacramento River from the Colusa Basin drain to the I Street Bridge, to which Auburn Ravine Creek, via East Side Canal and Natomas Cross Canal, is tributary. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply. Thus, beneficial uses applicable to Auburn Ravine Creek are as follows:

Table F-4. Basin Plan Beneficial Uses

Discharge Point	Receiving Water Name	Beneficial Use(s)
001	Auburn Ravine Creek	Existing uses from Table II-1 of the Basin Plan: Municipal and domestic water supply (MUN); Agricultural supply for irrigation (AGR); Water contact recreation, including canoeing, and rafting (REC-1); Non-contact water recreation (REC-2); Warm freshwater habitat (WARM); Cold freshwater habitat (COLD); Migration of aquatic organisms (MIGR), warm and cold; Spawning, reproduction, and/or early development (SPWN), warm and cold; Wildlife habitat (WILD); and Navigation (NAV).
--	Groundwater	Municipal and domestic supply (MUN); Agricultural supply, including irrigation and stock watering (AGR); Industrial process supply (PROC); and Industrial service supply (IND).

2. **National Toxics Rule (NTR) and California Toxics Rule (CTR).** U.S. EPA adopted the NTR on 22 December 1992, and later amended it on 4 May 1995 and 9 November 1999. About forty criteria in the NTR applied in California. On 18 May 2000, U.S. EPA adopted the CTR. The CTR promulgated new toxics criteria for California and, in addition,

incorporated the previously adopted NTR criteria that were applicable in the state. The CTR was amended on 13 February 2001. These rules contain federal water quality criteria for priority pollutants.

3. **State Implementation Policy.** On 2 March 2000, the State Water Board adopted the *Policy for Implementation of Toxics Standards for Inland Surface Waters, Enclosed Bays, and Estuaries of California* (State Implementation Policy or SIP). The SIP became effective on 28 April 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated for California by the U.S. EPA through the NTR and to the priority pollutant objectives established by the Central Valley Water Board in the Basin Plan. The SIP became effective on 18 May 2000, with respect to the priority pollutant criteria promulgated by the U.S. EPA through the CTR. The State Water Board adopted amendments to the SIP on 24 February 2005 that became effective on 13 July 2005. The SIP establishes implementation provisions for priority pollutant criteria and objectives and provisions for chronic toxicity control. Requirements of this Order implement the SIP.
4. **Antidegradation Policy.** Federal regulation 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 requires that the state water quality standards include an antidegradation policy consistent with the federal policy. The State Water Board established California's antidegradation policy in State Water Board Resolution 68-16. Resolution 68-16 is deemed to incorporate the federal antidegradation policy where the federal policy applies under federal law. Resolution 68-16 requires that existing water quality be maintained unless degradation is justified based on specific findings. The Central Valley Water Board's Basin Plan implements, and incorporates by reference, both the State and federal antidegradation policies. The permitted discharge must be consistent with the antidegradation provision of 40 C.F.R. section 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution 68-16.
5. **Anti-Backsliding Requirements.** Sections 402(o) and 303(d)(4) of the CWA and federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(l) restrict backsliding in NPDES permits. These anti-backsliding provisions require that effluent limitations in a reissued permit must be as stringent as those in the previous permit, with some exceptions in which limitations may be relaxed.
6. **Human Right to Water Act.** In compliance with Water Code section 106.3, it is the policy of the State of California that every human being has the right to safe, clean, affordable, and accessible water adequate for human consumption, cooking, and sanitary purposes. This Order promotes that policy by requiring discharges to meet maximum contaminant levels designed to protect human health and ensure that water is safe for domestic use.
7. **Endangered Species Act Requirements.** This Order does not authorize any act that results in the taking of a threatened or endangered species or any act that is now prohibited, or becomes prohibited in the future, under either the California Endangered Species Act (Fish and Game Code, §§ 2050 to 2097) or the Federal Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C.A. §§ 1531 to 1544). This Order requires compliance with effluent limits, receiving water limits, and other requirements to protect the beneficial uses of waters of the state. The Discharger is responsible for meeting all requirements of the applicable Endangered Species Act.
8. **Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act.** Section 13263.6(a) of the Water Code, requires that *"the Regional Water Board shall prescribe effluent limitations as part of the waste discharge requirements of a POTW for all substances that the most recent toxic chemical release data reported to the state emergency response commission pursuant to Section 313 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right to Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. Sec. 11023) (EPCRA) indicate as discharged into the*

POTW, for which the State Water Board or the Regional Water Board has established numeric water quality objectives, and has determined that the discharge is or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to, an excursion above any numeric water quality objective”.

The most recent toxic chemical data report does not indicate any reportable off-site releases or discharges to the collection system for this Facility. Therefore, a reasonable potential analysis (RPA) based on information from EPCRA cannot be conducted. Based on information from EPCRA, there is no reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an excursion above any numeric water quality objectives included within the Basin Plan or in any State Water Board plan, so no effluent limitations are included in this permit pursuant to Water Code section 13263.6(a).

However, as detailed elsewhere in this Order, available effluent data indicate that there are constituents present in the effluent that have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to exceedances of water quality standards and require inclusion of effluent limitations based on federal and state laws and regulations.

9. **Storm Water Requirements.** USEPA promulgated federal regulations for storm water on 16 November 1990 in 40 CFR Parts 122, 123, and 124. The NPDES Industrial Storm Water Program regulates storm water discharges from wastewater treatment facilities. Wastewater treatment plants are applicable industries under the storm water program and are obligated to comply with the federal regulations. The Discharger has submitted a Notice of Intent and been approved for coverage under the State Water Board’s Industrial Stormwater General Order. Therefore, this Order does not regulate storm water.

D. Impaired Water Bodies on CWA 303(d) List

1. Under section 303(d) of the 1972 CWA, states, territories and authorized tribes are required to develop lists of water quality limited segments. The waters on these lists do not meet water quality standards, even after point sources of pollution have installed the minimum required levels of pollution control technology. On 11 October 2011 USEPA gave final approval to California’s 2008-2010 section 303(d) List of Water Quality Limited Segments (WQLSs). The Basin Plan references this list of WQLSs, which are defined as “...those sections of lakes, streams, rivers or other fresh water bodies where water quality does not meet (or is not expected to meet) water quality standards even after the application of appropriate limitations for point sources (40 CFR Part 130, et seq.)”. The Basin Plan also states, “Additional treatment beyond minimum federal standards will be imposed on dischargers to [WQLSs]. Dischargers will be assigned or allocated a maximum allowable load of critical pollutants so that water quality objectives can be met in the segment.” Auburn Ravine and East Side Canal are not listed as impaired on the 303(d) list. The listing for the Natomas Cross Canal includes mercury. The listing for the Sacramento River (Knights Landing to the Delta) includes: chlordane, DDT, dieldrin, mercury, PCBs, and unknown toxicity.
2. **Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs).** USEPA requires the Central Valley Water Board to develop TMDLs for each 303(d) listed pollutant and water body combination. TMDLs have not been developed for this section of the Sacramento River; however, Table F-5, below, identifies the 303(d) listings and the status of each TMDL completion date.

Table F-5. 303 (d) List for Sacramento River (Knights Landing to the Delta)

Pollutant	Potential Sources	Proposed TMDL Completion
Chlordane	Agriculture	2021
DDT (Dichlorodiphenyltrichloroethane)	Agriculture	2021
Dieldrin	Agriculture	2022
Mercury	Resource Extraction	2012
PCBs (Polychlorinated biphenyls)	Source Unknown	2021
Unknown Toxicity	Source Unknown	2019

E. Other Plans, Polices and Regulations

1. **Title 27.** The discharge authorized herein and the treatment and storage facilities associated with the discharge of treated municipal wastewater, except for discharges of residual sludge and solid waste, are exempt from the requirements of Title 27, California Code of Regulations (CCR), section 20005 *et seq* (hereafter Title 27). The exemption, pursuant to Title 27 CCR section 20090(a), is based on the following:
 - a. The waste consists primarily of domestic sewage and treated effluent; and
 - b. The treatment and storage facilities described herein are associated with a municipal wastewater treatment plant.

IV. RATIONALE FOR EFFLUENT LIMITATIONS AND DISCHARGE SPECIFICATIONS

The CWA requires point source dischargers to control the amount of conventional, non-conventional, and toxic pollutants that are discharged into the waters of the United States. The control of pollutants discharged is established through effluent limitations and other requirements in NPDES permits. There are two principal bases for effluent limitations in the Code of Federal Regulations: 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards; and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) requires that permits include water quality-based effluent limitations (WQBELs) to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

Effluent limitations and toxic and pretreatment effluent standards established pursuant to sections 301 (Effluent Limitations), 302 (Water Quality Related Effluent Limitations), 304 (Information and Guidelines), and 307 (Toxic and Pretreatment Effluent Standards) of the CWA and amendments thereto are applicable to the discharge.

The CWA mandates the implementation of effluent limitations that are as stringent as necessary to meet water quality standards established pursuant to state or federal law [33 U.S.C., §1311(b)(1)(C); 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)]. NPDES permits must incorporate discharge limits necessary to ensure that water quality standards are met. This requirement applies to narrative criteria as well as to criteria specifying maximum amounts of particular pollutants. Pursuant to federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(i), NPDES permits must contain limits that control all pollutants that “*are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any state water quality standard, including state*

narrative criteria for water quality.” Federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi), further provide that “[w]here a state has not established a water quality criterion for a specific chemical pollutant that is present in an effluent at a concentration that causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion above a narrative criterion within an applicable State water quality standard, the permitting authority must establish effluent limits.”

The CWA requires point source dischargers to control the amount of conventional, non-conventional, and toxic pollutants that are discharged into the waters of the United States. The control of pollutants discharged is established through effluent limitations and other requirements in NPDES permits. There are two principal bases for effluent limitations in the Code of Federal Regulations: 40 CFR 122.44(a) requires that permits include applicable technology-based limitations and standards; and 40 CFR 122.44(d) requires that permits include WQBELs to attain and maintain applicable numeric and narrative water quality criteria to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water where numeric water quality objectives have not been established. The Basin Plan at page IV-17.00, contains an implementation policy, “*Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives*”, that specifies that the Central Valley Water Board “*will, on a case-by-case basis, adopt numerical limitations in orders which will implement the narrative objectives.*” This Policy complies with 40 CFR 122.44(d)(1). With respect to narrative objectives, the Central Valley Water Board must establish effluent limitations using one or more of three specified sources, including: (1) USEPA’s published water quality criteria, (2) a proposed state criterion (i.e., water quality objective) or an explicit state policy interpreting its narrative water quality criteria (i.e., the Central Valley Water Board’s “*Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives*”)(40 CFR 122.44(d)(1)(vi)(A), (B) or (C)), or (3) an indicator parameter.

The Basin Plan includes numeric site-specific water quality objectives and narrative objectives for toxicity, chemical constituents, discoloration, radionuclides, and tastes and odors. The narrative toxicity objective states: “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*” (Basin Plan at III-8.00) The Basin Plan states that material and relevant information, including numeric criteria, and recommendations from other agencies and scientific literature will be utilized in evaluating compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. The narrative chemical constituents objective states that waters shall not contain chemical constituents in concentrations that adversely affect beneficial uses. At minimum, “*...water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply (MUN) shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the maximum contaminant levels (MCLs)*” in Title 22 of CCR. The Basin Plan further states that, to protect all beneficial uses, the Central Valley Water Board may apply limits more stringent than MCLs. The narrative tastes and odors objective states: “*Water shall not contain taste- or odor-producing substances in concentrations that impart undesirable tastes or odors to domestic or municipal water supplies or to fish flesh or other edible products of aquatic origin, or that cause nuisance, or otherwise adversely affect beneficial uses.*”

A. Discharge Prohibitions

1. **Prohibition III.A (No discharge or application of waste other than that described in this Order).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13260 that requires filing of a ROWD before discharges can occur. The Discharger submitted a ROWD for the discharges described in this Order; therefore, discharges not described in this Order are prohibited.
2. **Prohibition III.B (No bypasses or overflow of untreated wastewater, except under the conditions at CFR Part 122.41(m)(4)).** As stated in section I.G of Attachment D, Standard Provisions, this Order prohibits bypass from any portion of the treatment facility. Federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.41(m), define “bypass” as the intentional diversion of waste streams from any portion of a treatment facility. This section of the

federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.41(m)(4), prohibits bypass unless it is unavoidable to prevent loss of life, personal injury, or severe property damage. In considering the Regional Water Board's prohibition of bypasses, the State Water Board adopted a precedential decision, Order No. WQO 2002-0015, which cites the federal regulations, 40 CFR 122.41(m), as allowing bypass only for essential maintenance to assure efficient operation.

3. **Prohibition III.C (No controllable condition shall create a nuisance).** This prohibition is based on Water Code section 13050 that requires water quality objectives established for the prevention of nuisance within a specific area. The Basin Plan prohibits conditions that create a nuisance.
4. **Prohibition III.D (No inclusion of pollutant free wastewater shall cause improper operation of the Facility's systems).** This prohibition is based on CFR Part 122.41 et seq. that requires the proper design and operation of treatment facilities.

B. Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

1. Scope and Authority

Section 301(b) of the CWA and implementing U.S. EPA permit regulations at 40 C.F.R. section 122.44 require that permits include conditions meeting applicable technology-based requirements at a minimum, and any more stringent effluent limitations necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The discharge authorized by this Order must meet minimum federal technology-based requirements based on Secondary Treatment Standards at 40 C.F.R. part 133.

Regulations promulgated in 40 C.F.R. section 125.3(a)(1) require technology-based effluent limitations for municipal Dischargers to be placed in NPDES permits based on Secondary Treatment Standards or Equivalent to Secondary Treatment Standards.

The Federal Water Pollution Control Act Amendments of 1972 (PL 92-500) established the minimum performance requirements for POTWs [defined in section 304(d)(1)]. Section 301(b)(1)(B) of that Act requires that such treatment works must, as a minimum, meet effluent limitations based on secondary treatment as defined by the U.S. EPA Administrator.

Based on this statutory requirement, U.S. EPA developed secondary treatment regulations, which are specified in 40 C.F.R. part 133. These technology-based regulations apply to all municipal wastewater treatment plants and identify the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment in terms of biochemical oxygen demand (BOD₅), total suspended solids (TSS), and pH.

2. Applicable Technology-Based Effluent Limitations

- a. **BOD₅ and TSS.** Federal regulations, 40 CFR Part 133, establish the minimum weekly and monthly average level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment for BOD₅ and TSS. As described in section IV.C.3.b.v of this Fact Sheet, WQBELs that are equal to or more stringent than the secondary technology-based treatment described in 40 CFR Part 133 are necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving stream and are applicable to this Facility.

Section 122.45(h) of 40 CFR specifies that effluent limitations may be applied to internal waste streams when standards imposed at the point of discharge are impractical or infeasible. After the equivalent of full tertiary treatment, including filtration and UV disinfection, tertiary treated wastewater may be discharged to Auburn Ravine Creek at Discharge Point 001 or may be diverted from the filter

clearwell to the tertiary storage basins until conditions in Auburn Ravine Creek are appropriate for disposal. The tertiary storage basins allow the Discharger 1) to store wastewater for recycled water uses, 2) to store final effluent during downstream flood events, or 3) to store effluent that does not meet the requirements of this Order (e.g., receiving water temperature limitations).

For this treatment process, the tertiary treatment standards required by the Department of Public Health (DPH) for BOD₅ and TSS have been met prior to discharge to the tertiary storage basins. When the tertiary treated wastewater, which has already achieved compliance with DPH standards, is removed from the storage basins for discharge to Auburn Ravine Creek, the wastewater may no longer meet the tertiary definitions for BOD₅, TSS, and total coliform organisms; however, the DPH standards have been met and no longer require confirmation. Under the CWA, only secondary treatment is required for surface water discharge, and the 30-day average BOD₅ and TSS limitations for secondary treatment are adequate. Therefore, it is not necessary to retreat the wastewater from the tertiary storage basins for BOD₅ and TSS removal to meet tertiary standards at the discharge point. Due to the retention time in the tertiary storage basins, storage in the tertiary storage basins may result in growth of algae, regrowth of microorganisms, and re-suspension of silts and sediments. Therefore, in order to meet the secondary effluent limitations, before the wastewater from the tertiary storage basins is discharged, it may be necessary to remove algae and particulates by rerouting the wastewater through the DAF units. The wastewater may also require an increase in dissolved oxygen by rerouting the wastewater through the reaeration basin. Thus, this Order contains tertiary effluent limitations for BOD₅ and TSS before discharge to surface water or to the tertiary storage basins at the filter clearwell with compliance measured at Monitoring Location INT-001 (see section IV.C.3.b.v of this Fact Sheet) and secondary effluent limitations for BOD₅ and TSS at Discharge Point 001 with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001.

A daily maximum effluent limitation for BOD₅ and TSS is also included in the Order at Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001) to ensure that the treatment works are not organically overloaded and operate in accordance with design capabilities. In addition, 40 CFR 133.102, in describing the minimum level of effluent quality attainable by secondary treatment, states that the 30-day average percent removal shall not be less than 85 percent. This Order contains limitations requiring an average of 85 percent removal of BOD₅ and TSS over each calendar month, applicable at Discharge Point 001.

- b. **Flow.** The Facility was designed to provide a tertiary level of treatment for up to a design average dry weather flow of 4.2 MGD. The outfall structure at Discharge Point 001 possesses a hydraulic design capacity of 13 MGD. As described in section II.E of this Fact Sheet, the Discharger is planning an upgrade project which will increase the average dry weather flow capacity to 5.9 MGD and the outfall capacity to 19 MGD. The Discharger may also further increase the average dry weather flow capacity to 8.4 MGD (or some smaller increase).

As described in section II.A of this Fact Sheet, treated effluent is stored in tertiary storage basins for varying intervals throughout the year prior to discharge. Stored effluent may be discharged from the tertiary storage basins to Discharge Point 001 without retreatment. Consistent with Order R5-2008-0156, this Order contains an average dry weather flow limitation of 4.2 MGD applicable at the filter clearwell (Monitoring Location INT-001). Upon compliance with Special Provisions VI.C.6.b.i and VI.C.6.b.ii, the average dry weather flow at Monitoring Location INT-001 may

increase to 5.9 MGD and 8.4 MGD (or some smaller increase), respectively. Although the Discharger is increasing the outfall capacity, the Discharger has not requested an increase in the average daily effluent flow limitation. Therefore, this Order retains the average daily effluent flow limitation of 12.2 MGD applied at Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001).

- c. **pH.** The secondary treatment regulations at 40 CFR Part 133 also require that pH be maintained between 6.0 and 9.0 standard units.

**Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations
 Filter Clearwell and Discharge Point 001**

Table F-6. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations – Filter Clearwell Internal Waste Stream Compliance Point (Monitoring Location INT-001)

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Average Dry Weather Flow	MGD	4.2 ¹	--	--	--	--
		5.9 ²	--	--	--	--
		8.4 ³	--	--	--	--

¹ Effective immediately and until compliance with Special Provision VI.C.6.b.i.
² Effective upon compliance with Special Provision VI.C.6.b.i.
³ Effective upon compliance with Special Provisions VI.C.6.b.i and VI.C.6.b.ii.

Table F-7. Summary of Technology-based Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001)

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Average Daily Discharge Flow	MGD	--	--	12.2	--	--
Conventional Pollutants						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	30	45	60	--	--
	lbs/day ¹	3,050	4,580	6,100	--	--
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--
pH ²	standard units	--	--	--	6.0	9.0
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	30	45	60	--	--
	lbs/day ¹	3,050	4,580	6,100	--	--
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--

¹ Based on an average daily discharge flow of 12.2 MGD.
² Note that more stringent WQBELs for pH are applicable and are established as final effluent limitations in this Order (see section IV.C.3.b of this Fact Sheet).

C. Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations (WQBELs)

1. Scope and Authority

CWA Section 301(b) and 40 C.F.R. section 122.44(d) require that permits include limitations more stringent than applicable federal technology-based requirements where

necessary to achieve applicable water quality standards. This Order contains requirements, expressed as a technology equivalence requirement, more stringent than secondary treatment requirements that are necessary to meet applicable water quality standards. The rationale for these requirements, which consist of tertiary treatment or equivalent requirements, is discussed in Section IV.C.3.b.iii of the Fact Sheet.

Section 122.44(d)(1)(i) of 40 C.F.R. requires that permits include effluent limitations for all pollutants that are or may be discharged at levels that have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of a water quality standard, including numeric and narrative objectives within a standard. Where reasonable potential has been established for a pollutant, but there is no numeric criterion or objective for the pollutant, WQBELs must be established using: (1) U.S. EPA criteria guidance under CWA section 304(a), supplemented where necessary by other relevant information; (2) an indicator parameter for the pollutant of concern; or (3) a calculated numeric water quality criterion, such as a proposed state criterion or policy interpreting the state's narrative criterion, supplemented with other relevant information, as provided in section 122.44(d)(1)(vi).

The process for determining reasonable potential and calculating WQBELs when necessary is intended to protect the designated uses of the receiving water as specified in the Basin Plan, and achieve applicable water quality objectives and criteria that are contained in other state plans and policies, or any applicable water quality criteria contained in the CTR and NTR.

2. Applicable Beneficial Uses and Water Quality Criteria and Objectives

The Basin Plan designates beneficial uses, establishes water quality objectives, and contains implementation programs and policies to achieve those objectives for all waters addressed through the plan. In addition, the Basin Plan implements State Water Board Resolution No. 88-63, which established state policy that all waters, with certain exceptions, should be considered suitable or potentially suitable for municipal or domestic supply.

The Basin Plan on page II-1.00 states: "*Protection and enhancement of existing and potential beneficial uses are primary goals of water quality planning...*" and with respect to disposal of wastewaters states that "*...disposal of wastewaters is [not] a prohibited use of waters of the State; it is merely a use which cannot be satisfied to the detriment of beneficial uses.*"

The federal CWA section 101(a)(2), states: "*it is the national goal that wherever attainable, an interim goal of water quality which provides for the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife, and for recreation in and on the water be achieved by July 1, 1983.*" Federal Regulations, developed to implement the requirements of the CWA, create a rebuttable presumption that all waters be designated as fishable and swimmable. Federal Regulations, 40 CFR sections 131.2 and 131.10, require that all waters of the State regulated to protect the beneficial uses of public water supply, protection and propagation of fish, shell fish and wildlife, recreation in and on the water, agricultural, industrial and other purposes including navigation. Section 131.3(e), 40 CFR, defines existing beneficial uses as those uses actually attained after 28 November 1975, whether or not they are included in the water quality standards. Federal Regulation, 40 CFR section 131.10 requires that uses be obtained by implementing effluent limitations, requires that all downstream uses be protected and states that in no case shall a state adopt waste transport or waste assimilation as a beneficial use for any waters of the United States.

- a. **Receiving Water and Beneficial Uses.** Refer to III.C.1. above for a complete description of the receiving water and beneficial uses.
- b. **Effluent and Ambient Background Data.** The RPA, as described in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet, was based on data from December 2008 through March 2013, which includes effluent and ambient background data submitted in SMRs and the ROWD.

An upstream receiving water sample collected on 29 December 2010 displayed elevated concentration levels for a series of metals (i.e., aluminum, copper, iron, lead, manganese, nickel, silver, and zinc). Documentation from the laboratory which conducted the analyses does not indicate any quality control issues; however, the SMR for the date indicates that flow rate and turbidity levels (313 MGD and 268 NTU) were observed to be well outside of typical receiving water conditions. The Central Valley Water Board considers this data to be unrepresentative of receiving water conditions in Auburn Ravine Creek and, therefore, has not been considered in the RPA.

- c. **Assimilative Capacity/Mixing Zone.** Based on the available information, the worst-case dilution for Auburn Ravine Creek is assumed to be zero to provide protection for the receiving water beneficial uses. The impact of assuming zero assimilative capacity within the receiving water is that discharge limitations are end-of-pipe limitations with no allowance for dilution within the receiving water.
- d. **Conversion Factors.** The CTR contains aquatic life criteria for arsenic, cadmium, chromium III, chromium VI, copper, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc which are presented in dissolved concentrations. USEPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations. The default USEPA conversion factors contained in Appendix 3 of the SIP were used to convert the applicable dissolved criteria to total recoverable criteria.
- e. **Hardness-Dependent CTR Metals Criteria.** The *California Toxics Rule* and the *National Toxics Rule* contain water quality criteria for seven metals that vary as a function of hardness. The lower the hardness the lower the water quality criteria. The metals with hardness-dependent criteria include cadmium, copper, chromium III, lead, nickel, silver, and zinc.

This Order has established the criteria for hardness-dependent metals based on the reasonable worst-case ambient hardness as required by the SIP¹, the CTR² and State Water Board Order No. WQO 2008-0008 (City of Davis). The SIP and the CTR require the use of "receiving water" or "actual ambient" hardness, respectively, to determine effluent limitations for these metals. (SIP, § 1.2; 40 CFR § 131.38(c)(4)) The CTR does not define whether the term "ambient," as applied in the regulations, necessarily requires the consideration of upstream as opposed to downstream hardness conditions. Therefore, where reliable, representative data are available, the hardness value for calculating criteria can be the downstream receiving water hardness, after mixing with the effluent (Order WQO 2008-0008, p.

¹ The SIP does not address how to determine the hardness for application to the equations for the protection of aquatic life when using hardness-dependent metals criteria. It simply states, in Section 1.2, that the criteria shall be properly adjusted for hardness using the hardness of the receiving water.

² The CTR requires that, for waters with a hardness of 400 mg/L (as CaCO₃), or less, the actual ambient hardness of the surface water must be used. It further requires that the hardness values used must be consistent with the design discharge conditions for design flows and mixing zones.

11). The Central Valley Water Board thus has considerable discretion in determining ambient hardness (*Id.*, p.10).

As discussed below, scientific literature provides a reliable method for calculating protective hardness-dependent CTR criteria, considering all discharge conditions. This methodology produces hardness-dependent CTR criteria based on the reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness that ensure these metals do not cause receiving water toxicity under any downstream receiving water condition. Under this methodology, the Central Valley Water Board considers all hardness conditions that could occur in the ambient downstream receiving water after the effluent has mixed with the water body¹. This ensures that effluent limitations are fully protective of aquatic life in all areas of the receiving water affected by the discharge under all flow conditions, at the fully mixed location, and throughout the water body including at the point of discharge into the water body.

- i. **Conducting the Reasonable Potential Analysis.** The SIP in Section 1.3 states, “*The RWQCB shall...determine whether a discharge may: (1) cause, (2) have a reasonable potential to cause, or (3) contribute to an excursion above any applicable priority pollutant criterion or objective.*” Section 1.3 provides a step-by-step procedure for conducting the RPA. The procedure requires the comparison of the maximum effluent concentration (MEC) and maximum ambient background concentration to the applicable criterion that has been properly adjusted for hardness. Unless otherwise noted, for the hardness-dependent CTR metals criteria the following procedures were followed for properly adjusting the criterion for hardness when conducting the RPA.
 - (a) The SIP requires WQBELs if the MEC is equal to or exceeds the applicable criterion, adjusted for hardness. For comparing the MEC to the applicable criterion, the “fully mixed” reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness was used to adjust the criterion. In this evaluation the portion of the receiving water affected by the discharge is analyzed. For hardness-dependent criteria, the hardness of the effluent has an impact on the determination of the applicable criterion in areas of the receiving water affected by the discharge. Therefore, for comparing the MEC to the applicable criterion, the reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness was used to adjust the criterion. For this situation it is necessary to consider the hardness of the effluent in determining the applicable hardness to adjust the criterion. The procedures for determining the applicable criterion after proper adjustment using the reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness is outlined in subsection ii, below.
 - (b) The SIP requires WQBELs if the receiving water is impaired upstream (outside the influence) of the discharge, i.e., if the Maximum Ambient Background Concentration of a pollutant exceeds the applicable criterion, adjusted for hardness². For comparing the Maximum Ambient Background Concentration to the applicable criterion, the reasonable worst-case upstream ambient hardness was used to adjust the criteria. This is appropriate, because this area is outside the influence of the

¹ All effluent discharges will change the ambient downstream metals concentration and hardness. It is not possible to change the metals concentration without also changing the hardness.

² The pollutant must also be detected in the effluent.

discharge. Since the discharge does not impact the upstream hardness, the effect of the effluent hardness was not included in this evaluation.

- ii. **Calculating Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations.** The remaining discussion in this section relates to the development of WQBELs when it has been determined that the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CTR hardness-dependent metals criteria in the receiving water.

A 2006 Study¹ developed procedures for calculating the effluent concentration allowance (ECA)² for CTR hardness-dependent metals. The 2006 Study demonstrated that it is necessary to evaluate all discharge conditions (e.g. high and low flow conditions) and the hardness and metals concentrations of the effluent and receiving water when determining the appropriate ECA for these hardness-dependent metals. This method is superior to relying on downstream receiving water samples alone because it captures all possible mixed conditions in the receiving water. Both receiving water and effluent hardness vary based on flow and other factors, but the variability of receiving water and effluent hardness is sometimes independent. Using a calculated hardness value ensures that the Central Valley Water Board considers all possible mixed downstream values that may result from these two independent variables. Relying on receiving water sampling alone is less likely to capture all possible mixed downstream conditions.

The equation describing the total recoverable regulatory criterion, as established in the CTR³, is as follows:

$$\text{CTR Criterion} = \text{WER} \times (e^{m[\ln(H)]+b}) \quad (\text{Equation 1})$$

Where:

H = hardness (as CaCO₃)⁴

WER = water-effect ratio

m, b = metal- and criterion-specific constants

In accordance with the CTR, the default value for the WER is 1. A WER study must be conducted to use a value other than 1. The constants “m” and “b” are specific to both the metal under consideration, and the type of total recoverable criterion (i.e., acute or chronic). The metal-specific values for these constants are provided in the CTR at paragraph (b)(2), Table 1.

The equation for the ECA is defined in Section 1.4, Step 2, of the SIP and is as follows:

$$\text{ECA} = C \quad (\text{when } C \leq B)^5 \quad (\text{Equation 2})$$

Where:

¹ Emerick, R.W.; Borroum, Y.; & Pedri, J.E., 2006. California and National Toxics Rule Implementation and Development of Protective Hardness Based Metal Effluent Limitations. WEFTEC, Chicago, Ill.

² The ECA is defined in Appendix 1 of the SIP (page Appendix 1-2). The ECA is used to calculate WQBELs in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP.

³ 40 CFR § 131.38(b)(2).

⁴ For this discussion, all hardness values are in mg/L as CaCO₃.

⁵ The 2006 Study assumes the ambient background metals concentration is equal to the CTR criterion (i.e. C ≤ B)

C = the priority pollutant criterion/objective, adjusted for hardness (see Equation 1, above)

B = the ambient background concentration

The 2006 Study demonstrated that the relationship between hardness and the calculated criteria is the same for some metals, so the same procedure for calculating the ECA may be used for these metals. The same procedure can be used for chronic cadmium, chromium III, copper, nickel, and zinc. These metals are hereinafter referred to as “Concave Down Metals”. “Concave Down” refers to the shape of the curve represented by the relationship between hardness and the CTR criteria in Equation 1. Another similar procedure can be used for determining the ECA for acute cadmium, lead, and acute silver, which are referred to hereafter as “Concave Up Metals”.

ECA for Chronic Cadmium, Chromium III, Copper, Nickel, and Zinc – For Concave Down Metals (i.e., chronic cadmium, chromium III, copper, nickel, and zinc) the 2006 Study demonstrates that when the effluent is in compliance with the CTR criteria and the upstream receiving water is in compliance with the CTR criteria, any mixture of the effluent and receiving water will always be in compliance with the CTR criteria¹. The 2006 Study proves that regardless of whether the effluent hardness is lower or greater than the upstream hardness, the reasonable worst-case flow condition is the effluent dominated condition (i.e., no receiving water flow)². Consequently, for Concave Down Metals, the CTR criteria have been calculated using the downstream ambient hardness under this condition.

The effluent hardness ranged from 60 mg/L to 110 mg/L, based on 483 samples from December 2008 to March 2013. The upstream receiving water hardness varied from 18 mg/L to 96 mg/L, based on 195 samples from December 2008 to March 2013, and the downstream receiving water hardness varied from 20 mg/L to 94 mg/L based on 159 samples collected during the same period. Under the effluent dominated condition, the reasonable worst-case downstream ambient hardness is 60 mg/L. As demonstrated in the example shown in Table F-8, below, using this hardness to calculate the ECA for all concave down metals will result in WQBELs that are protective under all flow conditions, from the effluent dominated condition to high flow condition. This example for zinc assumes the following conservative conditions for the upstream receiving water:

- Upstream receiving water always at the lowest observed upstream receiving water hardness (i.e., 18 mg/L)
- Upstream receiving water zinc concentration always at the CTR criteria (i.e., no assimilative capacity).

Using these reasonable worst-case receiving water conditions, a simple mass balance (as shown in Equation 3, below) accounts for all possible mixtures of effluent and receiving water under all flow conditions.

¹ 2006 Study, p. 5700

² There are two typographical errors in the 2006 Study in the discussion of concave down metals when the effluent hardness is less than the receiving water hardness. The effluent and receiving water hardness were transposed in the discussion, but the correct hardness values were used in the calculations. The typographical errors were confirmed by the author of the 2006 Study, by email dated 1 April 2011, from Dr. Robert Emerick to Mr. James Marshall, Central Valley Water Board.

$$C_{MIX} = C_{RW} \times (1-EF) + C_{Eff} \times (EF) \quad (\text{Equation 3})$$

Where:

C_{MIX} = Mixed concentration (e.g. metals or hardness)

C_{RW} = Upstream receiving water concentration

C_{Eff} = Effluent concentration

EF = Effluent Fraction

In this example, for zinc, for any receiving water flow condition (high flow to low flow), the fully-mixed downstream ambient zinc concentration is in compliance with the CTR criteria¹.

Table F-8. Zinc ECA Evaluation

		Lowest Observed Effluent Hardness			60 mg/L (as CaCO₃)
		Lowest Observed Upstream Receiving Water Hardness			18 mg/L (as CaCO₃)
		Highest Assumed Upstream Receiving Water Zinc Concentration			28 µg/L¹
		Zinc ECA_{chronic}²			77 µg/L
		Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration			
Effluent Fraction⁶		Hardness³ (mg/L)	CTR Criteria⁴ (µg/L)	Zinc⁵ (µg/L)	Complies with CTR Criteria
High Flow  Low Flow	1%	18	29	29	Yes
	5%	20	31	31	Yes
	15%	24	36	36	Yes
	25%	29	41	40	Yes
	50%	39	54	53	Yes
	75%	50	66	65	Yes
	100%	60	78	78	Yes

¹ Highest assumed upstream receiving water zinc concentration calculated using Equation 1 for chronic criterion at a hardness of 18 mg/L.

² ECA calculated using Equation 1 for chronic criterion at a hardness of 60 mg/L.

³ Fully mixed downstream ambient hardness is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent hardness at the applicable effluent fraction using Equation 3.

⁴ Fully mixed downstream ambient criteria are the chronic criteria calculated using Equation 1 at the mixed hardness.

⁵ Fully mixed downstream ambient zinc concentration is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent zinc concentrations at the applicable effluent fraction using Equation 3.

⁶ The effluent fraction ranges from 1% at the high receiving water flow condition, to 100% at the lowest receiving water flow condition (i.e., effluent dominated).

ECA for Acute Cadmium, Lead, and Acute Silver – For concave up metals (i.e., acute cadmium, lead, and acute silver), the relationship between hardness and the metals criteria is different than for concave down metals. The 2006 Study demonstrates that for concave up metals, the effluent and upstream receiving water can be in compliance with the CTR criteria, but the resulting

¹ This method considers the actual lowest observed upstream hardness and actual lowest observed effluent hardness to determine the reasonable worst-case ambient downstream hardness under all possible receiving water flow conditions. Table F-8 demonstrates that the receiving water is always in compliance with the CTR criteria at the fully-mixed location in the receiving water. It also demonstrates that the receiving water is in compliance with the CTR criteria for all mixtures from the point of discharge to the fully-mixed location. Therefore, a mixing zone is not used for compliance.

mixture may contain metals concentrations that exceed the CTR criteria and could cause toxicity. For these metals, the 2006 Study provides a mathematical approach to calculate the ECA that is protective of aquatic life, in all areas of the receiving water affected by the discharge, under all discharge and receiving water flow conditions (see Equation 4, below).

The ECA, as calculated using Equation 4, is based on the reasonable worst-case upstream receiving water hardness, the lowest observed effluent hardness, and assuming no receiving water assimilative capacity for metals (i.e., ambient background metals concentrations are at their respective CTR criterion). Equation 4 is not used in place of the CTR equation (Equation 1). Rather, Equation 4, which is derived using the CTR equation, is used as a direct approach for calculating the ECA. This replaces an iterative approach for calculating the ECA. The CTR equation has been used to evaluate the receiving water downstream of the discharge at all discharge and flow conditions to ensure the ECA is protective (e.g., see Table F-9).

$$ECA = \left(\frac{m(H_e - H_{rw}) \left(e^{m \ln(H_{rw}) + b} \right)}{H_{rw}} \right) + e^{m \ln(H_{rw}) + b} \quad (\text{Equation 4})$$

Where:

m, b= criterion specific constants (from CTR)

H_e = lowest observed effluent hardness

H_{rw} = reasonable worst-case upstream receiving water hardness

An example similar to the concave down metals is shown for lead, a concave up metal, in Table F-9, below. As previously mentioned, the lowest effluent hardness is 60 mg/L, while the upstream receiving water hardness ranged from 18 mg/L to 96 mg/L, and the downstream receiving water hardness ranged from 20 mg/L to 94 mg/L. In this case, the reasonable worst-case upstream receiving water hardness to use in Equation 4 to calculate the ECA is 18 mg/L.

Using the procedures discussed above to calculate the ECA for all concave up metals will result in WQBELs that are protective under all potential effluent/receiving water flow conditions (high flow to low flow) and under all known hardness conditions, as demonstrated in Table F-9, for lead.

Table F-9. Lead ECA Evaluation

		Lowest Observed Effluent Hardness			60 mg/L
		Reasonable Worst-case Upstream Receiving Water Hardness			18 mg/L
		Reasonable Worst-case Upstream Receiving Water Lead Concentration			0.36 µg/L¹
		Lead ECA_{chronic}²			1.4 µg/L
		Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration			
Effluent Fraction⁶		Hardness³ (mg/L) (as CaCO₃)	CTR Criteria⁴ (µg/L)	Lead⁵ (µg/L)	Complies with CTR Criteria
High Flow  Low Flow	1%	18	0.37	0.37	Yes
	5%	20	0.41	0.41	Yes
	15%	24	0.53	0.52	Yes
	25%	29	0.64	0.62	Yes
	50%	39	0.96	0.89	Yes
	75%	50	1.3	1.2	Yes
	100%	60	1.7	1.4	Yes

¹ Reasonable worst-case upstream receiving water lead concentration calculated using Equation 1 for chronic criterion at a hardness of 18 mg/L.
² ECA calculated using Equation 4 for chronic criteria.
³ Fully mixed downstream ambient hardness is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent hardness at the applicable effluent fraction.
⁴ Fully mixed downstream ambient criteria are the chronic criteria calculated using Equation 1 at the mixed hardness.
⁵ Fully mixed downstream ambient lead concentration is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent lead concentrations at the applicable effluent fraction.
⁶ The effluent fraction ranges from 1% at the high receiving water flow condition, to 100% at the lowest receiving water flow condition (i.e., effluent dominated).

As discussed above, the receiving water at times contains concentrations of lead that exceed water quality criteria associated with the hardness condition previous to the discharge. The 2006 study procedures remain applicable under these conditions. The discharge cannot cause or contribute to a violation of water quality criteria/objectives in the receiving water. Although metals concentrations downstream of the discharge exceed CTR criteria, the cause of the exceedance is not due to the discharge, it is due to the elevated metals concentrations upstream of the discharge. Implementing the procedures of the 2006 study does not result in an increase in toxicity downstream of the discharge, and in fact reduces the amount of toxicity already present in the receiving water. This is demonstrated in the example below for lead (see Table F-10).

As shown in Table F-10 for lead, prior to the discharge the lead has been observed to exceed water quality criteria by up to 318%. When the receiving water contains some fraction of effluent, the percent exceedance is reduced. The greater the amount of effluent in the receiving water, the lower the percent exceedance, until a fully compliant state is achieved when the effluent constitutes the entire flow. The effluent limitation associated with lead, therefore, was sufficient to assure that the discharge never causes or contributes to a violation of a water quality criterion, and in fact reduces the amount of toxicity already present in the receiving water.

Table F-10. Lead ECA Evaluation

		Lowest Observed Effluent Hardness			60 mg/L
		Lowest Observed Upstream Receiving Water Hardness			18 mg/L
		Highest Observed Upstream Receiving Water Lead Concentration			1.5 µg/L
		Lead ECA_{chronic}¹			1.4 µg/L
		Fully Mixed Downstream Ambient Concentration			
Effluent Fraction⁵		Hardness² (mg/L)	CTR Criteria³ (µg/L)	Lead⁴ (µg/L)	Percent Exceeding Criterion
High Flow  Low Flow	0%	18	0.36	1.5	318%
	5%	20	0.41	1.5	263%
	15%	24	0.53	1.5	185%
	25%	29	0.64	1.5	133%
	50%	39	0.96	1.5	56%
	75%	50	1.3	1.4	15%
	100%	60	1.7	1.4	0%

- ¹ ECA calculated using Equation 1 for chronic criterion at a hardness of 60 mg/L.
- ² Fully mixed downstream ambient hardness is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent hardness at the applicable effluent fraction using Equation 3.
- ³ Fully mixed downstream ambient criteria are the chronic criteria calculated using Equation 1 at the mixed hardness.
- ⁴ Fully mixed downstream ambient lead concentration is the mixture of the receiving water and effluent lead concentrations at the applicable effluent fraction using Equation 3.
- ⁵ The effluent fraction ranges from 0% at the high receiving water flow condition, to 100% at the lowest receiving water flow condition (i.e., effluent dominated).

Based on the procedures discussed above, Table F-11 lists all the CTR hardness-dependent metals and the associated ECA used in this Order.

Table F-11. Summary of ECA Evaluations for CTR Hardness-dependent Metals

CTR Metals	ECA (µg/L, total recoverable)	
	Acute	Chronic
Copper	18	14
Chromium III	426	51
Cadmium	0.65	0.64
Lead	9.2	0.36
Nickel	110	12
Silver	0.21	--
Zinc	28	28

3. Determining the Need for WQBELs

- a. **Constituents with No Reasonable Potential.** WQBELs are not included in this Order for constituents that do not demonstrate reasonable potential (i.e., constituents were not detected in the effluent or receiving water at concentrations exceeding applicable water quality criteria); however, monitoring for those pollutants is established in this Order as required by the SIP. If the results of effluent monitoring demonstrate reasonable potential, this Order may be reopened and modified by adding an appropriate effluent limitation.

Most constituents with no reasonable potential are not discussed in this Order. However, the following constituents were found to have no reasonable potential after assessment of the data:

i. **Aluminum**

Aluminum is the third most abundant element in the earth's crust and is ubiquitous in both soils and aquatic sediments. When mobilized in surface waters, aluminum has been shown to be toxic to various fish species. However, the potential for aluminum toxicity in surface waters is directly related to the chemical form of aluminum present, and the chemical form is highly dependent on water quality characteristics that ultimately determine the mechanism of aluminum toxicity. Surface water characteristics, including pH, temperature, colloidal material, fluoride and sulfate concentrations, and total organic carbon, all influence aluminum speciation and its subsequent bioavailability to aquatic life. Calcium [hardness] concentrations in surface water may also reduce aluminum toxicity by competing with monomeric aluminum (Al^{3+}) binding to negatively charged fish gills.

- (a) **WQO.** The Code of Federal Regulations promulgated criteria for priority toxic pollutants for California's surface waters as part of section 131.38 Establishment of Numeric Criteria for Priority Toxic Pollutants for the State of California (California Toxics Rule or CTR), including metals criteria. However, aluminum criteria were not promulgated as part of the CTR. Absent numeric aquatic life criteria for aluminum, WQBEL's in the Central Valley Region's NPDES permits are based on the Basin Plans' narrative toxicity objective. The Basin Plans' Policy for Application of Water Quality Objectives requires the Central Valley Water Board to consider, "*on a case-by-case basis, direct evidence of beneficial use impacts, all material and relevant information submitted by the discharger and other interested parties, and relevant numerical criteria and guidelines developed and/or published by other agencies and organizations. In considering such criteria, the Board evaluates whether the specific numerical criteria which are available through these sources and through other information supplied to the Board, are relevant and appropriate to the situation at hand and, therefore, should be used in determining compliance with the narrative objective.*" Relevant information includes, but is not limited to (1) USEPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria (NAWQC) and subsequent Correction, (2) site-specific conditions of Auburn Ravine Creek, the receiving water, and (3) site-specific aluminum studies conducted by dischargers within the Central Valley Region. (Basin Plan, p. IV.-17.00; see also, 40 CFR 122.44(d)(vi).)

USEPA NAWQC. USEPA recommended the NAWQC aluminum acute criterion at 750 $\mu\text{g/L}$ based on test waters with a pH of 6.5 to 9.0. USEPA also recommended the NAWQC aluminum chronic criterion at 87 $\mu\text{g/L}$ based upon the following two toxicity tests. All test waters contained hardness at 12 mg/L as CaCO_3 .

- (1) Acute toxicity tests at various aluminum doses were conducted in various acidic waters (pH 6.0 – 6.5) on 159- and 160-day old striped bass. The 159-day old striped bass showed no mortality in waters with pH at 6.5 and aluminum doses at 390 $\mu\text{g/L}$, and the 160-day old striped bass showed 58% mortality at a dose of 174.4 $\mu\text{g/L}$ in same

pH waters. However, the 160-day old striped bass showed 98% mortality at aluminum dose of 87.2 µg/L in waters with pH at 6.0, which is USEPA's basis for the 87 µg/L chronic criterion. The varied results draw into question this study and the applicability of the NAWQC chronic criterion of 87 µg/L.

- (2) Chronic toxicity effects on 60-day old brook trout were evaluated in circumneutral pH waters (6.5-6.9 pH) in five cells at various aluminum doses (4, 57, 88, 169, and 350 µg/L). Chronic evaluation started upon hatching of eyed eggs of brook trout, and their weight and length were measure after 45 days and 60 days. The 60-day old brook trout showed 24% weight loss at 169 µg/L of aluminum and 4% weight loss at 88 µg/L of aluminum, which is the basis for USEPA's chronic criteria. Though this test study shows chronic toxic effects 4% reduction in weight after exposure for 60-days, the chronic criterion is based on 4-day exposure; so again, the applicability of the NAWQC chronic criterion of 87 µg/L is questionable.

Site-specific Conditions. Effluent and receiving water monitoring data indicate that the pH and hardness values are not similar to the low pH and hardness conditions under which the chronic criterion for aluminum was developed, as shown in the table below, and therefore, the Central Valley Water Board does not expect aluminum to be as reactive in Auburn Ravine Creek as in the previously described toxicity tests. The pH of Auburn Ravine Creek, the receiving water, ranged from 6.19 to 8.7 with an average of 7.4 based on 1,581 monitoring results obtained between December 2008 and March 2013. These water conditions are circumneutral pH where aluminum is predominately in the form of Al(OH)₃ and non-toxic to aquatic life. The hardness of Auburn Ravine Creek ranged from 18 mg/L to 96 mg/L based on 195 samples, which is above the conditions, and thus less toxic, than the tests used to develop the chronic criterion. Auburn Ravine Creek supports aquatic species such as Chinook salmon and steelhead (rainbow trout). Brook trout and striped bass have not been surveyed nor expected to be present (<http://bios.dfg.ca.gov/>) since striped bass is non-native to California and brook trout is present in higher elevation lakes and streams.

Parameter	Units	Test Conditions for Applicability of Chronic Criterion	Effluent	Receiving Water
pH	standard units	6.0 – 6.5	5.1 – 8.2	6.19 – 8.7
Hardness, Total (as CaCO ₃)	mg/L	12	60 – 110	18 – 96
Aluminum, Total Recoverable	µg/L	87.2 - 390	9.7 – 186	150 – 510

Local Environmental Conditions and Studies. Twenty-one site-specific aluminum toxicity tests have been conducted within the Central Valley Region. The pH and hardness of Auburn Ravine Creek are similar, as shown in the table below, and thus the results of these site-specific aluminum toxicity tests are relevant and appropriate for Auburn Ravine Creek. As shown in the following table, all EC₅₀ toxicity study result values are at concentrations of aluminum above 5,000 µg/L. Thus, the toxic effects of aluminum in surface waters within the Central Valley Region,

including Auburn Ravine Creek, is less toxic (or less reactive) to aquatic species than demonstrated in the toxicity tests that USEPA used for the basis of establishing the chronic criterion of 87 µg/L. This new information, and review of the toxicity tests USEPA used to establish the chronic criterion, indicates that 87 µg/L is overly stringent and not applicable to Auburn Ravine Creek.

Discharger (City)	Species	Test Waters	Hardness Value	Total Aluminum EC ₅₀ Value	pH	WER
Auburn	<i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>	Effluent	99	>5270	7.44	>19.3
	“ “	Surface Water	16	>5160	7.44	>12.4
Manteca	“ “	Surface Water/Effluent	124	>8800	9.14	N/C
	“ “	Effluent	117	>8700	7.21	>27.8
	“ “	Surface Water	57	7823	7.58	25.0
	“ “	Effluent	139	>9500	7.97	>21.2
	“ “	Surface Water	104	>11000	8.28	>24.5
	“ “	Effluent	128	>9700	7.78	>25.0
	“ “	Surface Water	85	>9450	7.85	>25.7
	“ “	Effluent	106	>11900	7.66	>15.3
	“ “	Surface Water	146	>10650	7.81	>13.7
Modesto	“ “	Surface Water/Effluent	120/156	31604	8.96	211
Yuba City	“ “	Surface Water/Effluent	114/164 ¹	>8000	7.60/7.46	>53.5
Placer County	“ “	Effluent	150	>5000	7.4 – 8.7	>13.7
Manteca	<i>Daphnia magna</i>	Surface Water/Effluent	124	>8350	9.14	N/C
Modesto	“ “	Surface Water/Effluent	120/156	>11900	8.96	>79.6
Yuba City	“ “	Surface Water/Effluent	114/164 ¹	>8000	7.60/7.46	>53.5
Manteca	<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i> (rainbow trout)	Surface Water/Effluent	124	>8600	9.14	N/C
Auburn	“ “	Surface Water	16	>16500	7.44	N/C
Modesto	“ “	Surface Water/Effluent	120/156	>34250	8.96	>229
Yuba City	“ “	Surface Water/Effluent	114/164 ¹	>8000	7.60/7.46	>53.5

¹ Hardness values may be biased high because the EDTA titrimetric method is subject to interferences that measure as hardness (barium, cadmium, lead, manganese, strontium, and zinc will be measured as hardness) producing hardness numbers that are likely to be greater than the calculation of hardness based upon the ICP analysis of calcium and magnesium. Upstream receiving water hardness ranged from 30 to 50.9 mg/L as CaCO₃ between January 2008 and August 2011. Furthermore, the upstream receiving water hardness was 37 mg/L as CaCO₃ on 4 October 2005, 7 days prior to the Feasibility Assessment (first phase of a Water Effects Ratio study) sample collection date of 11 October 2005. It is likely that matrix interferences from other metals were responsible for the unexpected hardness values reported by Pacific EcoRisk.

The Discharger has not conducted a toxicity test for aluminum; however, the City of Auburn conducted two toxicity tests in Auburn Ravine Creek, shown highlighted in the previous table. The City of Auburn is located at an elevation of approximately 1,400 feet above sea level, and is surrounded by forest. As shown, the test water quality characteristics of these Auburn Ravine Creek samples are similar to those for the Facility in a different reach of the same receiving water, with the pH at 7.4 and hardness at 16 mg/L as CaCO₃ in comparison to the mean pH at 7.4 and the minimum hardness at 18 mg/L (mean hardness at 52 mg/L) as CaCO₃, respectively. Thus, based on these two similar primary water quality characteristics (pH and hardness) that drive aluminum speciation,

the aluminum toxicity within Auburn Ravine Creek for the City of Auburn is expected to be similar in to the reach of the same creek to which the Facility Discharges. Therefore, the City of Auburn aluminum toxicity test study is relevant and appropriate in this case for use in determining the specific numerical criteria to be used in determining compliance with the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. The Auburn Ravine Creek aluminum toxicity study resulted in a site-specific aluminum objective at 1,079 µg/L. Thus, these results support the conclusion that the 87 µg/L chronic criterion is overly stringent for Auburn Ravine Creek in the vicinity of the Facility's discharge.

DPH has established Secondary Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) to assist public drinking water systems in managing their drinking water for aesthetic conditions such as taste, color, and odor. The Secondary MCL for aluminum is 200 µg/L. U.S. EPA has also adopted a NAWQC acute criterion of 750 µg/L for the protection of aquatic life. Order R5-2008-0156 contained effluent limitations of aluminum based on the Secondary MCL and on the NAWQC acute criterion.

- (b) **RPA Results.** For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Aluminum is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used its judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

The most stringent objective is the Secondary MCL, which is derived from human welfare considerations (e.g., taste, odor, laundry staining), not for toxicity. Secondary MCLs are drinking water standards contained in Title 22 of the California Code of Regulations. Title 22 requires compliance with these standards on an annual average basis, when sampling at least quarterly. To be consistent with how compliance with the standards is determined, the RPA was conducted based on the calendar annual average effluent aluminum concentrations. The maximum annual average effluent concentration for aluminum was 69 µg/L based on 41 samples collected between January 2009 and February 2013. Effluent aluminum is generally less than the concentrations in the receiving water and below the Secondary MCL. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance in the receiving water.

For protection of acute toxicity to aquatic life, the NAWQC recommends the acute criterion at 750 µg/L. Effluent concentrations from January 2009 to February 2013 ranged from 14 µg/L to 186 µg/L, which is below the acute criterion. Therefore, aluminum in the discharge does not have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of acute toxicity to aquatic life.

Since the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential, the effluent limitations for aluminum have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

ii. **Bis (2-ethylhexyl) Phthalate**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes a criterion of 1.8 µg/L for the protection of human health for waters where both water and organisms are consumed.
- (b) **RPA Results.** Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is a common contaminant of sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment, and sources of detected bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate may be from plastics used for sampling or analytical equipment. “Clean techniques” are used to ensure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detections for monitoring bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate.

Bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was detected in the effluent and receiving water at concentrations of 1.8 µg/L on 27 September 2011. The laboratory report for the 27 September 2011 effluent and receiving water samples indicate that bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was detected in the method blanks. Section 1.2 of the SIP states “The RWQCB shall have discretion to consider if any data are inappropriate or insufficient for use in implementing this Policy. Instances where such consideration is warranted include, but are not limited to, the following: evidence that a sample has been erroneously reported or is not representative of effluent or ambient receiving water quality; questionable quality control/quality assurance practices; and varying seasonal conditions.” The Central Valley Water Board finds that the 27 September 2011 effluent and receiving water samples for bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate are not representative of the discharge and did not use the data in conducting the RPA.

Excluding the 27 September 2011 effluent sample, bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was not detected in the effluent based on three samples collected between December 2008 and March 2013. Excluding the 27 September 2011 receiving water sample, bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate was not detected in the receiving water based on three samples collected between December 2008 and March 2013. Therefore, bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate in the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criterion for the protection of human health.

iii. **Chlorine Residual**

- (a) **WQO.** USEPA developed NAWQC for protection of freshwater aquatic life for chlorine residual. The recommended 4-day average (chronic) and 1-hour average (acute) criteria for chlorine residual are 0.011 mg/L and 0.019 mg/L, respectively. These criteria are protective of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective. Order R5-2008-0156 included effluent limitations for chlorine residual based on the NAWQC.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The Facility utilizes chlorine disinfectant in periodic maintenance activities but does not utilize chlorine-containing disinfectants on the effluent. Instead, the Facility utilizes a UV disinfection system for pathogen control. Therefore, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC in the receiving water, and the WQBELs for chlorine residual have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent

limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

iv. **Copper**

- (a) **WQO.** The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for copper. These criteria for copper are presented in dissolved concentrations. USEPA recommends conversion factors to translate dissolved concentrations to total concentrations.

Order R5-2008-0156 contained effluent limitations for copper based on a default water effects ratio (WER) of 1.0. During the term of Order R5-2008-0156, the Discharger submitted a study entitled “*City of Lincoln Copper Water-Effect Ratio Study*” based on standards and procedures contained in U.S. EPA’s *Streamlined Water-Effect Ratio Procedure for Discharges of Copper* (2001). Consistent with the streamlined procedures, the Discharger performed two sampling events to assess ambient conditions and to calculate a freshwater copper WER using the primary test species, *Ceriodaphnia dubia*. Based on the results of the study, the Discharger concluded that a dissolved WER for copper of 6.34, based on effluent data to represent low flow, zero-dilution discharge conditions, is applicable to the discharge to Auburn Ravine Creek. The Central Valley Water Board has reviewed the study and concluded that the Discharger’s proposed WER is applicable to the discharge to Auburn Ravine Creek.

- (b) **RPA.** Section IV.C.2.e of this Fact Sheet includes procedures for conducting the RPA for hardness-dependent CTR metals, such as copper. The CTR includes hardness-dependent criteria for copper for the receiving water. The RPA was conducted using the upstream receiving water hardness to calculate the criteria for comparison to the maximum ambient background concentration, and likewise using the reasonable worst-case downstream hardness to compare to the MEC. The table below shows the specific criteria used for the RPA.

	CTR Chronic Criterion (Total Recoverable)	Maximum Concentration (Total Recoverable)	Reasonable Potential? (Y/N)
Receiving Water	14 µg/L ¹	4.9 µg/L	No ²
Effluent	38 µg/L ³	3.31 µg/L	No ⁴

¹ Based on lowest observed upstream hardness of 18 mg/L (as CaCO₃) and a WER of 6.34

² Per Section 1.3, step 6 of the SIP.

³ Based on reasonable worst-case downstream hardness of 60 mg/L (as CaCO₃) and a WER of 6.34.

⁴ Per Section 1.3, step 4 of the SIP.

Based on the available data, copper in the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the CTR criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life criterion, and the WQBELs for copper have not been retained in this Order. Removal of these effluent limitations is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

v. **Salinity**

(a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan contains a chemical constituent objective that incorporates state MCLs, contains a narrative objective, and contains numeric water quality objectives for certain specified water bodies for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, sulfate, and chloride. The USEPA Ambient Water Quality Criteria for Chloride recommends acute and chronic criteria for the protection of aquatic life. There are no USEPA water quality criteria for the protection of aquatic life for electrical conductivity, total dissolved solids, and sulfate. Additionally, there are no USEPA numeric water quality criteria for the protection of agricultural, livestock, and industrial uses. Numeric values for the protection of these uses are typically based on site specific conditions and evaluations to determine the appropriate constituent threshold necessary to interpret the narrative chemical constituent Basin Plan objective. The Central Valley Water Board must determine the applicable numeric limit to implement the narrative objective for the protection of agricultural supply. The Central Valley Water Board is currently implementing the CV-SALTS initiative to - develop a Basin Plan Amendment that will establish a salt and nitrate Management Plan for the Central Valley. Through this effort the Basin Plan will be amended to define how the narrative water quality objective is to be interpreted for the protection of agricultural use. All studies conducted through this Order to establish an agricultural limit to implement the narrative objective will be reviewed by and consistent with the efforts currently underway by CV-SALTS.

Order R5-2008-0156 contained an interim performance-based annual average EC limitation based on current treatment plant performance of 690 µmhos/cm. Order R5-2008-0156 did not contain final limits for salinity parameters. The interim limitation was effective beginning on the effective date of Order R5-2008-0156 (23 October 2008) and ended on the expiration date of the permit (23 October 2013).

Parameter	Agricultural WQ Objective ¹	Secondary MCL ²	USEPA NAWQC	Effluent	
				Average	Maximum
EC (µmhos/cm)	Varies	900, 1600, 2200	N/A	446	615
TDS (mg/L)	Varies	500, 1000, 1500	N/A	278	340
Sulfate (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	N/A	28	31
Chloride (mg/L)	Varies	250, 500, 600	860 1-hr 230 4-day	49	69

¹ Narrative chemical constituent objective of the Basin Plan. Procedures for establishing the applicable numeric limitation to implement the narrative objective can be found in the Policy for Application of Water Quality, Chapter IV, Section 8 of the Basin Plan. However, the Basin Plan does not require improvement over naturally occurring background concentrations. In cases where the natural background concentration of a particular constituent exceeds an applicable water quality objective, the natural background concentration will be considered to comply with the objective.

² The Secondary MCLs are stated as a recommended level, upper level, and a short-term maximum level.

(1) **Chloride.** The Secondary MCL for chloride is 250 mg/L, as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.

- (2) **Electrical Conductivity.** The Secondary MCL for EC is 900 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ as a recommended level, 1600 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ as an upper level, and 2200 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ as a short-term maximum.
- (3) **Sulfate.** The Secondary MCL for sulfate is 250 mg/L as a recommended level, 500 mg/L as an upper level, and 600 mg/L as a short-term maximum.
- (4) **Total Dissolved Solids.** The Secondary MCL for TDS is 500 mg/L as a recommended level, 1000 mg/L as an upper level, and 1500 mg/L as a short-term maximum.

(b) **RPA Results**

- (1) **Chloride.** Chloride concentrations in the effluent ranged from 37 mg/L to 69 mg/L, with an average of 49 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Background concentrations in Auburn Ravine Creek ranged from 2.9 mg/L to 7.8 mg/L, with an average of 5.5 mg/L, for four samples collected by the Discharger from December 2008 through March 2013.
- (2) **Electrical Conductivity.** A review of the Discharger's monitoring reports shows an average effluent EC of 446 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$, with a range from 358 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$ to 615 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$. The background receiving water EC averaged 132 $\mu\text{mhos/cm}$. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL.
- (3) **Sulfate.** Sulfate concentrations in the effluent ranged from 26 mg/L to 31 mg/L, with an average of 28 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Background concentrations in Auburn Ravine Creek ranged from 2.6 mg/L to 11 mg/L, with an average of 6.5 mg/L.
- (4) **Total Dissolved Solids.** The average TDS effluent concentration was 278 mg/L with concentrations ranging from 226 mg/L to 340 mg/L. These levels do not exceed the Secondary MCL. Receiving water data for TDS is not available.

Based on the relatively low reported salinity, the discharge does not have reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion of water quality objectives for salinity. However, since the Discharger discharges to Auburn Ravine Creek, a tributary of the Sacramento River and eventually the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta, of additional concern is the salt contribution to Delta waters. Allowing the Discharger to increase its current salt loading may be contrary to the Region-wide effort to address salinity in the Central Valley. Therefore, in order to ensure that the Discharger will continue to control the discharge of salinity, this Order includes a requirement to continue to implement their salinity evaluation and minimization plan. The interim effluent limitation for salinity has not been retained in this Order. Removal of this effluent limitation is in accordance with federal anti-backsliding regulations (see section IV.D.3 of the Fact Sheet).

- b. **Constituents with Reasonable Potential.** The Central Valley Water Board finds that the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above a water quality standard for ammonia, BOD₅, mercury, pathogens, pH, and TSS. WQBELs for these constituents are included in this Order. A

summary of the RPA is provided in Attachment G, and a detailed discussion of the RPA for each constituent is provided below.

i. **Ammonia**

- (a) **WQO.** The NAWQC for the protection of freshwater aquatic life for total ammonia, recommends acute (1-hour average; criteria maximum concentration or CMC) standards based on pH and chronic (30-day average; criteria continuous concentration or CCC) standards based on pH and temperature. USEPA also recommends that no 4-day average concentration should exceed 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. USEPA found that as pH increased, both the acute and chronic toxicity of ammonia increased. Salmonids were more sensitive to acute toxicity effects than other species. However, while the acute toxicity of ammonia was not influenced by temperature, it was found that invertebrates and young fish experienced increasing chronic toxicity effects with increasing temperature. Because the Auburn Ravine Creek has a beneficial use of cold freshwater habitat and the presence of salmonids and early fish life stages in the Auburn Ravine Creek is well-documented, the recommended criteria for waters where salmonids and early life stages are present, were used.

The maximum permitted effluent pH is 8.5, as the Basin Plan objective for pH in the receiving stream is the range of 6.5 to 8.5. In order to protect against the worst-case short-term exposure of an organism, a pH value of 8.5 was used to derive the acute criterion. The resulting acute criterion is 2.14 mg/L.

A chronic criterion was calculated for each day when paired temperature and pH were measured using downstream receiving water data for temperature and pH. Rolling 30-day average criteria were calculated from downstream data using the criteria calculated for each day and the minimum observed 30-day average criterion was established as the applicable 30-day average chronic criterion, or 30-day CCC. The resulting 30-day CCC is 2.53 mg/L (as N). The 4-day average concentration is derived in accordance with the USEPA criterion as 2.5 times the 30-day CCC. Based on the 30-day CCC of 2.53 mg/L (as N), the 4-day average concentration that should not be exceeded is 6.33 mg/L (as N).

- (b) **RPA Results.** The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Untreated domestic wastewater contains ammonia in concentrations that, without treatment, would be harmful to fish and would violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective if discharged to the receiving water. Reasonable potential therefore exists and effluent limitations are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, "*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.*" For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Ammonia is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has

used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

USEPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBELs are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBELs for pathogens in all permits for POTWs discharging to contact recreational waters).*" USEPA's TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, "*When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.*" With regard to POTWs, USEPA recommends that, "*POTWs should also be characterized for the possibility of chlorine and ammonia problems.*" (TSD, p. 50)

Nitrification is a biological process that converts ammonia to nitrite and nitrite to nitrate. Denitrification is a process that converts nitrate to nitrite or nitric oxide and then to nitrous oxide or nitrogen gas, which is then released to the atmosphere. The Discharger currently uses nitrification to remove ammonia from the waste stream. Inadequate or incomplete nitrification may result in the discharge of ammonia to the receiving stream. Ammonia is known to cause toxicity to aquatic organisms in surface waters. Discharges of ammonia in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses to human, plant, animal, or aquatic life would violate the Basin Plan narrative toxicity objective. Although the Discharger nitrifies the discharge, inadequate or incomplete nitrification creates the potential for ammonia to be discharged and provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the NAWQC. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge has reasonable potential for ammonia and WQBELs are required.

- (c) **WQBELs.** The Central Valley Water Board calculates WQBELs in accordance with SIP procedures for non-CTR constituents, and ammonia is a non-CTR constituent. The SIP procedure assumes a 4-day averaging period for calculating the long-term average discharge condition (LTA). However, USEPA recommends modifying the procedure for calculating permit limits for ammonia using a 30-day averaging period for the calculation of the LTA corresponding to the 30-day CCC. Therefore, while the LTAs corresponding to the acute and 4-day chronic criteria were calculated according to SIP procedures, the LTA corresponding to the 30-day CCC was calculated assuming a 30-day averaging period. The lowest LTA representing the acute, 4-day CCC, and 30-day CCC is then selected for deriving the average monthly effluent limitation (AMEL) and the maximum daily effluent limitation (MDEL). The remainder of the

WQBEL calculation for ammonia was performed according to the SIP procedures. This Order contains a final AMEL and MDEL for total ammonia of 0.7 mg/L (as N) and 2.1 mg/L (as N), respectively, based on the NAWQC.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** The Facility is designed to provide complete nitrification of the discharge. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board concludes that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

ii. **Mercury**

- (a) **WQO.** The current NAWQC for protection of freshwater aquatic life, continuous concentration, for mercury is 0.77 µg/L (30-day average, chronic criteria). The CTR contains a human health criterion (based on a threshold dose level causing neurological effects in infants) of 0.050 µg/L for waters from which both water and aquatic organisms are consumed. Both values are controversial and subject to change. In 40 CFR Part 131, USEPA acknowledges that the human health criteria may not be protective of some aquatic or endangered species and that “...*more stringent mercury limits may be determined and implemented through use of the State’s narrative criterion.*” In the CTR, USEPA reserved the mercury criteria for freshwater and aquatic life and may adopt new criteria at a later date.
- (b) **RPA Results.** The MEC for mercury was 0.0006 µg/L based on 16 samples collected from December 2008 to March 2013. Mercury was not evaluated in the receiving water during the term of Order R5-2008-0156. Mercury bioaccumulates in fish tissue and, therefore, the discharge of mercury to the receiving water may contribute to exceedances of the narrative toxicity objective and impact beneficial uses. The Natomas Cross Canal and Sacramento River from Knights Landing to the Delta, to which Auburn Ravine Creek is tributary, have been listed as an impaired water body pursuant to CWA section 303(d) because of mercury and the discharge must not cause or contribute to increased mercury levels. A TMDL is under development for the Natomas Cross Canal and Sacramento River downstream of the Facility which may include a waste load allocation applicable to the Facility.
- (c) **WQBELs.** Consistent with Order R5-2008-0156, this Order contains a performance-based mass effluent limitation of 0.022 lbs/month for mercury for the effluent discharged to the receiving water, which is applicable until completion of the regionalization project with the Placer County SMD1 WWTP. The mass limit in Order R5-2008-0156 was derived using an MEC of 0.021 µg/L and the design average dry weather flow of the existing treatment plant (4.2 MGD), as shown below:

Mass Loading from the Existing Treatment Plant

$$0.000021 \text{ mg/L} * 4.2 \text{ MGD} * 8.34 \text{ (conversion factor)} * 365 \text{ days} / 12 \text{ months} = 0.022 \text{ lbs/month}$$

When the regionalization project is complete, the Facility will receive an additional mercury mass loading from the Placer County SMD1 WWTP. As discussed in Order R5-2010-0092, the MEC for mercury from the Placer County SMD1 WWTP was 0.00323 µg/L. Upon completion of the

regionalization project, the Facility will accept an additional flow of 1.7 MGD from the Placer County SMD1 WWTP. Therefore, the additional mass loading contributed by the Placer County SMD1 WWTP was calculated using an MEC of 0.00323 µg/L and the additional flow from the Placer County SMD1 WWTP (1.7 MGD), , which results in an additional loading of 0.0014 pounds/month, as shown below:

Mass Loading from the Placer County SMD1 WWTP

$$0.00000323 \text{ mg/L} * 1.7 \text{ MGD} * 8.34 \text{ (conversion factor)} * 365 \text{ days} / 12 \text{ months} = 0.0014 \text{ lbs/month}$$

Therefore, after regionalization the Discharger shall be subject to a performance-based effluent limitation of 0.0234 lbs/month, which represents the sum of the mass loading from the existing treatment plant (0.022 lbs/month) and the Placer County SMD1 WWTP (0.0014 lbs/month). This Order does not allow for an increase in mass loading beyond that necessary to accommodate the regionalization project with the Placer County SMD1 WWTP. Expansion of the system capacity beyond 5.9 MGD shall not result in additional mercury mass loadings to the receiving water. This limitation is based on maintaining the mercury loading at the current level until a TMDL can be established and USEPA develops mercury standards that are protective of human health. If USEPA develops new water quality standards for mercury, this permit may be reopened and the effluent limitations adjusted.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** Analysis of the effluent data shows the Facility can meet these WQBELs.

iii. **Pathogens**

- (a) **WQO.** DPH has developed reclamation criteria, CCR, Division 4, Chapter 3 (Title 22), for the reuse of wastewater. Title 22 requires that for spray irrigation of food crops, parks, playgrounds, schoolyards, and other areas of similar public access, wastewater be adequately disinfected, oxidized, coagulated, clarified, and filtered, and that the effluent total coliform levels not exceed 2.2 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median; 23 MPN/100 mL, not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period; and 240 MPN/100 mL, at any time.

Title 22 also requires that recycled water used as a source of water supply for non-restricted recreational impoundments be disinfected tertiary recycled water that has been subjected to conventional treatment. A non-restricted recreational impoundment is defined as “...an impoundment of recycled water, in which no limitations are imposed on body-contact water recreational activities.” Title 22 is not directly applicable to surface waters; however, the Central Valley Water Board finds that it is appropriate to apply an equivalent level of treatment to that required by the DPH’s reclamation criteria because the receiving water is used for irrigation of agricultural land and for contact recreation purposes. The stringent disinfection criteria of Title 22 are appropriate since the undiluted effluent may be used for the irrigation of food crops and/or for body-contact water recreation. Coliform organisms are intended as an indicator of the effectiveness of the entire treatment train and the effectiveness of removing other pathogens.

- (b) **RPA Results.** Raw domestic wastewater inherently contains human pathogens that threaten human health and life, and constitute a threatened pollution and nuisance under CWC Section 13050 if discharged untreated to the receiving water. Reasonable potential for pathogens therefore exists and WQBELs are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, "*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.*" For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Pathogens are not priority pollutants. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

USEPA's September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer's Manual, page 6-30, states, "*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBELs are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBELs for pathogens in all permits for POTWs discharging to contact recreational waters).*" USEPA's TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, "*When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.*" (TSD, p. 50)

The beneficial uses of Auburn Ravine Creek include municipal and domestic supply, water contact recreation, and agricultural irrigation supply, and there is, at times, less than 20:1 dilution. To protect these beneficial uses, the Central Valley Water Board finds that the wastewater must be disinfected and adequately treated to prevent disease. Although the Discharger provides disinfection, inadequate or incomplete disinfection creates the potential for pathogens to be discharged. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board finds the discharge has reasonable potential for pathogens and WQBELs are required.

- (c) **WQBELs.** In accordance with the requirements of Title 22, this Order includes effluent limitations for total coliform organisms of 2.2 MPN/100 mL as a 7-day median; 23 MPN/100 mL, not to be exceeded more than once in a 30-day period; and 240 MPN/100 mL as an instantaneous maximum.

The tertiary treatment process, or equivalent, is capable of reliably treating wastewater to a turbidity level of 2 nephelometric turbidity units (NTU) as a daily average. Failure of the filtration system such that virus removal is impaired would normally result in increased particles in the effluent, which result in higher effluent turbidity. Turbidity has a major advantage for monitoring filter performance. Coliform testing, by comparison, is not conducted continuously and requires several hours, to days, to identify high coliform concentrations. Therefore, to ensure compliance with the DPH recommended Title 22 disinfection criteria, weekly average specifications are impracticable for turbidity. This Order includes operational specifications for turbidity of 2 NTU as a daily average; 5 NTU, not to be exceeded more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period; and 10 NTU as an instantaneous maximum.

This Order contains effluent limitations for BOD₅, total coliform organisms, and TSS, and requires a tertiary level of treatment, or equivalent, necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. The Central Valley Water Board has previously considered the factors in Water Code section 13241 in establishing these requirements.

Final WQBELs for BOD₅ and TSS are based on the technical capability of the tertiary process, which is necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water. BOD₅ is a measure of the amount of oxygen used in the biochemical oxidation of organic matter. The tertiary treatment standards for BOD₅ and TSS are indicators of the effectiveness of the tertiary treatment process. The principal design parameter for wastewater treatment plants is the daily BOD₅ and TSS loading rates and the corresponding removal rate of the system. The application of tertiary treatment processes results in the ability to achieve lower levels for BOD₅ and TSS than the secondary standards currently prescribed. Therefore, this Order requires AMELs for BOD₅ and TSS of 10 mg/L, which is technically based on the capability of a tertiary system. In addition to the average weekly and average monthly effluent limitations, a daily maximum effluent limitation for BOD₅ and TSS is included in the Order to ensure that the treatment works are not organically overloaded and operate in accordance with design capabilities.

Section 122.45(h) of 40 CFR specifies that effluent limitations may be applied to internal waste streams when standards imposed at the point of discharge are impractical or infeasible. As described further in section II.A and IV.B.2, this Order contains tertiary effluent limitations for BOD₅ and TSS before discharge to surface water or to the tertiary storage basins at the filter clearwell with compliance measured at Monitoring Location INT-001 (see section IV.C.3.b.v of this Fact Sheet) and secondary effluent limitations for BOD₅ and TSS at Discharge Point 001 with compliance measured at Monitoring Location EFF-001. Additionally, compliance with the effluent limitations for total coliform organisms shall be assessed at the filter clearwell at Monitoring Location INT-001.

- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** The Facility possesses media filtration and a UV disinfection system which were designed to achieve Title 22 criteria. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that immediate compliance with these effluent limitations is feasible.

iv. **pH**

- (a) **WQO.** The Basin Plan includes a water quality objective for surface waters (except for Goose Lake) that the “...pH shall not be depressed below 6.5 nor raised above 8.5.”
- (b) **RPA Results.** Raw domestic wastewater inherently has variable pH. Additionally, some wastewater treatment processes can increase or decrease wastewater pH which if not properly controlled, would violate the Basin Plan’s numeric objective for pH in the receiving water. Therefore, reasonable potential exists for pH and WQBELs are required.

Federal regulations at 40 C.F.R. §122.44(d)(1)(i) requires that, “*Limitations must control all pollutants or pollutant parameters (either conventional, nonconventional, or toxic pollutants) which the Director determines are or may be discharged at a level which will cause, have the reasonable potential to cause, or contribute to an excursion above any State water quality standard, including State narrative criteria for water quality.*” For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. pH is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA for this non-priority pollutant constituent.

USEPA’s September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, page 6-30, states, “*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBELs are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBELs for pathogens in all permits for POTWs discharging to contact recreational waters).*” USEPA’s TSD also recommends that factors other than effluent data should be considered in the RPA, “*When determining whether or not a discharge causes, has the reasonable potential to cause, or contributes to an excursion of a numeric or narrative water quality criterion for individual toxicants or for toxicity, the regulatory authority can use a variety of factors and information where facility-specific effluent monitoring data are unavailable. These factors also should be considered with available effluent monitoring data.*” (TSD, p. 50)

The Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater. Based on 1,581 samples taken from December 2008 to March 2013, the maximum pH reported was 8.2 and the minimum was 5.1. The Facility did exceed the instantaneous maximum effluent limitation during this period. Although the Discharger has proper pH controls in place, the pH for the Facility’s influent varies due to the nature of municipal sewage, which provides the basis for the discharge to have a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above the Basin Plan’s numeric objective for pH in the receiving water. Therefore, WQBELs for pH are required in this Order.

- (c) **WQBELs.** Effluent limitations for pH of 6.5 as an instantaneous minimum and 8.5 as an instantaneous maximum are included in this Order based on protection of the Basin Plan objectives for pH.
- (d) **Plant Performance and Attainability.** The effluent pH was below the instantaneous minimum limitation in four of 1,581 samples. The effluent did not exceed the instantaneous maximum limitation based on 1,581 samples. The Central Valley Water Board concludes, therefore, that the Facility can immediately comply with these WQBELs.

4. WQBEL Calculations

- a. This Order includes WQBELs for ammonia, BOD₅, mercury, pH, total coliform organisms, and TSS. The general methodology for calculating WQBELs based on the different criteria/objectives is described in subsections IV.C.4.b through e, below. See Attachment H for the WQBEL calculations.
- b. **Effluent Concentration Allowance.** For each water quality criterion/objective, the ECA is calculated using the following steady-state mass balance equation from Section 1.4 of the SIP:

$$ECA = C + D(C - B) \quad \text{where } C > B, \text{ and}$$
$$ECA = C \quad \text{where } C \leq B$$

where:

- ECA = effluent concentration allowance
- D = dilution credit
- C = the priority pollutant criterion/objective
- B = the ambient background concentration.

According to the SIP, the ambient background concentration (B) in the equation above shall be the observed maximum with the exception that an ECA calculated from a priority pollutant criterion/objective that is intended to protect human health from carcinogenic effects shall use the arithmetic mean concentration of the ambient background samples. For ECAs based on MCLs, which implement the Basin Plan's chemical constituents objective and are applied as annual averages, an arithmetic mean is also used for B due to the long-term basis of the criteria.

- c. **Basin Plan Objectives and MCLs.** For WQBELs based on site-specific numeric Basin Plan objectives or MCLs, the effluent limitations are applied directly as the ECA as either an MDEL, AMEL, or average annual effluent limitations, depending on the averaging period of the objective.
- d. **Aquatic Toxicity Criteria.** WQBELs based on acute and chronic aquatic toxicity criteria are calculated in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP. The ECAs are converted to equivalent long-term averages (i.e. LTA_{acute} and LTA_{chronic}) using statistical multipliers and the lowest LTA is used to calculate the AMEL and MDEL using additional statistical multipliers.
- e. **Human Health Criteria.** WQBELs based on human health criteria, are also calculated in accordance with Section 1.4 of the SIP. The ECAs are set equal to the AMEL and a statistical multiplier was used to calculate the MDEL.

$$AMEL = mult_{AMEL} \left[\min \left(\overbrace{M_A ECA_{acute}}^{LTA_{acute}}, M_C ECA_{chronic} \right) \right]$$

$$MDEL = mult_{MDEL} \left[\min \left(M_A ECA_{acute}, \underbrace{M_C ECA_{chronic}}_{LTA_{chronic}} \right) \right]$$

$$MDEL_{HH} = \left(\frac{mult_{MDEL}}{mult_{AMEL}} \right) AMEL_{HH}$$

where:

$mult_{AMEL}$ = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to AMEL

$mult_{MDEL}$ = statistical multiplier converting minimum LTA to MDEL

M_A = statistical multiplier converting acute ECA to LTA_{acute}

M_C = statistical multiplier converting chronic ECA to $LTA_{chronic}$

**Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations
Filter Clearwell and Discharge Point 001**

Table F-12. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations – Filter Clearwell Internal Waste Stream Compliance Point (Monitoring Location INT-001)

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Conventional Pollutants						
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 25°C)	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--
Non-Conventional Pollutants						
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	--	2.2 ¹	23 ²	--	240

¹ Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.

² Not to be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.

Table F-13. Summary of Water Quality-Based Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001)

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Conventional Pollutants						
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5
Priority Pollutants						
Mercury, Total Recoverable	lbs/month	0.022 ¹	--	--	--	--
		0.0234 ²	--	--	--	--

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations				
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum
Non-Conventional Pollutants						
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	0.7	--	2.1	--	--
	lbs/day ³	71	--	214	--	--

¹ The total monthly mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.022 lbs/month. Effective immediately and until 1 September 2015.
² The total monthly mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.0234 lbs/month. Effective 1 September 2015 and upon compliance with Special Provision VI.C.6.b.i.
³ Based on maximum daily discharge flow of 12.2 MGD.

5. Whole Effluent Toxicity (WET)

For compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective, this Order requires the Discharger to conduct whole effluent toxicity testing for acute and chronic toxicity, as specified in the Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E section V.). This Order also contains effluent limitations for acute toxicity and requires the Discharger to implement best management practices to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity.

- a. **Acute Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00) The Basin Plan also states that, “*...effluent limits based upon acute biotoxicity tests of effluents will be prescribed where appropriate...*”.

For priority pollutants, the SIP dictates the procedures for conducting the RPA. Acute toxicity is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, the Central Valley Water Board is not restricted to one particular RPA method. Acute whole effluent toxicity is not a priority pollutant. Therefore, due to the site-specific conditions of the discharge, the Central Valley Water Board has used professional judgment in determining the appropriate method for conducting the RPA. USEPA’s September 2010 NPDES Permit Writer’s Manual, page 6-30, states, “*State implementation procedures might allow, or even require, a permit writer to determine reasonable potential through a qualitative assessment process without using available facility-specific effluent monitoring data or when such data are not available...A permitting authority might also determine that WQBELs are required for specific pollutants for all facilities that exhibit certain operational or discharge characteristics (e.g., WQBELs for pathogens in all permits for POTWs discharging to contact recreational waters).*” Although the discharge has been consistently in compliance with the acute effluent limitations, the Facility is a POTW that treats domestic wastewater containing ammonia and other acutely toxic pollutants. Acute toxicity effluent limits are required to ensure compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

USEPA Region 9 provided guidance for the development of acute toxicity effluent limitations in the absence of numeric water quality objectives for toxicity in its document titled "Guidance for NPDES Permit Issuance", dated February 1994. In section B.2. "Toxicity Requirements" (pgs. 14-15) it states that, "*In the absence of specific numeric water quality objectives for acute and chronic toxicity, the narrative criterion 'no toxics in toxic amounts' applies. Achievement of the narrative criterion, as applied herein, means that ambient waters shall not demonstrate for acute*

toxicity: 1) less than 90% survival, 50% of the time, based on the monthly median, or 2) less than 70% survival, 10% of the time, based on any monthly median. For chronic toxicity, ambient waters shall not demonstrate a test result of greater than 1 TUc." Consistent with Order R5-2008-0156, effluent limitations for acute toxicity have been included in this Order as follows:

Acute Toxicity. Survival of aquatic organisms in 96-hour bioassays of undiluted waste shall be no less than:

Minimum for any one bioassay -----70%
 Median for any three consecutive bioassays -----90%

- b. **Chronic Aquatic Toxicity.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, "All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life." (Basin Plan at page III-8.00.) As shown in Table F-14 below, chronic toxicity levels exceed the numeric toxicity trigger of 1 TUc in multiple samples. Based on chronic WET testing performed by the Discharger from December 2008 through March 2013, the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.

Table F-14. Whole Effluent Chronic Toxicity Testing Results

Date	Fathead Minnow <i>Pimephales promelas</i>		Water Flea <i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>		Green Algae <i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i>
	Survival (TUc)	Growth (TUc)	Survival (TUc)	Reproduction (TUc)	Growth (TUc)
1 March 2010	1	1	1	1	1
7 June 2010	1.3	1.3	4	4	1
6 July 2010 ¹	--	--	1	4	--
9 August 2010 ¹	--	--	1	1	--
23 August 2010 ¹	--	--	1	1	--
7 September 2010 ¹	--	--	1	8	--
20 September 2010	1	1	1	1	1
29 November 2010	1	1	1	1	1
1 December 2010	--	--	1	1	--
13 December 2010	--	--	1	1	--
27 December 2010	--	--	1	1	--
7 March 2011	1	1	1	1	1
11 April 2011	1	1	1	1	1
1 August 2011	1	1	1	1	1
6 December 2011	1	1	1	1	1
6 February 2012	1	1	1	1	4
6 March 2012 ¹	--	--	--	--	1
20 March 2012 ¹	--	--	--	--	1.3
3 April 2012 ¹	1	1	1	1	1
16 April 2012 ¹	--	--	--	--	1
20 August 2012	1	1	1	1	1
10 December 2012	1	1	1	4	1
1 January 2013	--	--	1	1	--
25 February 2013	1	1	1	1	1
11 March 2013	--	--	1	1	--

Date	Fathead Minnow <i>Pimephales promelas</i>		Water Flea <i>Ceriodaphnia dubia</i>		Green Algae <i>Selenastrum capricornutum</i>
	Survival (TUc)	Growth (TUc)	Survival (TUc)	Reproduction (TUc)	Growth (TUc)
25 March 2013	--	--	1	8	--

¹ Results from an accelerated monitoring event.

No dilution has been granted for the chronic condition. Therefore, chronic toxicity testing results exceeding 1 chronic toxicity unit (TUc) demonstrates the discharge has a reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires quarterly chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. In addition to WET monitoring, the Special Provision in section VI.C.2.a of the Order requires the Discharger to submit to the Central Valley Water Board an Initial Investigative TRE Workplan for approval by the Executive Officer, to ensure the Discharger has a plan to immediately move forward with the initial tiers of a TRE, in the event effluent toxicity is encountered in the future. The provision also includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, requirements for accelerated monitoring, and requirements for TRE initiation if toxicity is demonstrated.

Numeric chronic WET effluent limitations have not been included in this Order. The SIP contains implementation gaps regarding the appropriate form and implementation of chronic toxicity limits. This has resulted in the petitioning of a NPDES permit in the Los Angeles Region¹ that contained numeric chronic toxicity effluent limitations. To address the petition, the State Water Board adopted WQO 2003-012 directing its staff to revise the toxicity control provisions in the SIP. The State Water Board states the following in WQO 2003-012, *“In reviewing this petition and receiving comments from numerous interested persons on the propriety of including numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity in NPDES permits for publicly-owned treatment works that discharge to inland waters, we have determined that this issue should be considered in a regulatory setting, in order to allow for full public discussion and deliberation. We intend to modify the SIP to specifically address the issue. We anticipate that review will occur within the next year. We therefore decline to make a determination here regarding the propriety of the final numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity contained in these permits.”* The process to revise the SIP is currently underway. Proposed changes include clarifying the appropriate form of effluent toxicity limits in NPDES permits and general expansion and standardization of toxicity control implementation related to the NPDES permitting process. Since the toxicity control provisions in the SIP are under revision it is infeasible to develop numeric effluent limitations for chronic toxicity. Therefore, this Order requires that the Discharger meet best management practices for compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective, as allowed under 40 CFR 122.44(k).

To ensure compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective, the Discharger is required to conduct chronic WET testing, as specified in the

¹ In the Matter of the Review of Own Motion of Waste Discharge Requirements Order Nos. R4-2002-0121 [NPDES No. CA0054011] and R4-2002-0123 [NPDES NO. CA0055119] and Time Schedule Order Nos. R4-2002-0122 and R4-2002-0124 for Los Coyotes and Long Beach Wastewater Reclamation Plants Issued by the California Regional Water Quality Control Board, Los Angeles Region SWRCB/OCC FILES A-1496 AND 1496(a)

Monitoring and Reporting Program (Attachment E section V.). Furthermore, the Special Provision contained at VI.C.2.a. of this Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify and implement corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity. If the discharge demonstrates toxicity exceeding the numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, the Discharger is required to initiate a TRE in accordance with an approved TRE Workplan. The numeric toxicity monitoring trigger is not an effluent limitation; it is the toxicity threshold at which the Discharger is required to perform accelerated chronic toxicity monitoring, as well as, the threshold to initiate a TRE if effluent toxicity has been demonstrated.

D. Final Effluent Limitation Considerations

1. Mass-based Effluent Limitations

40 CFR 122.45(f)(1) requires effluent limitations be expressed in terms of mass, with some exceptions, and 40 CFR 122.45(f)(2) allows pollutants that are limited in terms of mass to additionally be limited in terms of other units of measurement. This Order includes effluent limitations expressed in terms of mass and concentration. In addition, pursuant to the exceptions to mass limitations provided in 40 CFR 122.45(f)(1), some effluent limitations are not expressed in terms of mass, such as pH and temperature, and when the applicable standards are expressed in terms of concentration (e.g., CTR criteria and MCLs) and mass limitations are not necessary to protect the beneficial uses of the receiving water.

Mass-based effluent limitations have been established in this Order for ammonia, BOD₅, and TSS because they are oxygen demanding substances. A mass-based effluent limitation has been established for mercury because it is a bioaccumulative pollutant. Except for the pollutants listed above, mass-based effluent limitations are not included in this Order for pollutant parameters for which effluent limitations are based on water quality objectives and criteria that are concentration-based.

40 CFR 122.45(b)(1) requires that mass-based effluent limitations for POTWs be calculated based on the design flow. Although the Facility has a design average dry weather flow of 4.2 MGD, this Order includes an average daily discharge limit of 12.2 MGD based on the design capacity of the outfall, as discharges from the tertiary storage basins may exceed the average dry weather flow. Therefore, mass-based effluent limitations were calculated based upon the permitted average daily discharge flow of 12.2 MGD in this Order.

2. Averaging Periods for Effluent Limitations

40 CFR 122.45 (d) requires average weekly and average monthly discharge limitations for publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) unless impracticable. However, for toxic pollutants and pollutant parameters in water quality permitting, USEPA recommends the use of an MDEL in lieu of average weekly effluent limitations (AWELs) for two reasons. *“First, the basis for the 7-day average for POTWs derives from the secondary treatment requirements. This basis is not related to the need for assuring achievement of water quality standards. Second, a 7-day average, which could comprise up to seven or more daily samples, could average out peak toxic concentrations and therefore the discharge’s potential for causing acute toxic effects would be missed.”* (TSD, pg. 96) This Order uses MDELs in lieu of AWELs for ammonia as recommended by the TSD for the achievement of water quality standards and for the protection of the beneficial uses of the receiving stream. Furthermore, for BOD₅, pH, total coliform organisms, and TSS, weekly average effluent limitations have been replaced or supplemented with effluent

limitations utilizing shorter averaging periods. The rationale for using shorter averaging periods for these constituents is discussed in section IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

3. Satisfaction of Anti-Backsliding Requirements

The Clean Water Act specifies that a revised permit may not include effluent limitations that are less stringent than the previous permit unless a less stringent limitation is justified based on exceptions to the anti-backsliding provisions contained in Clean Water Act sections 402(o) or 303(d)(4), or, where applicable, 40 CFR 122.44(l).

The effluent limitations in this Order are at least as stringent as the effluent limitations in the previous Order, with the exception of effluent limitations for aluminum, ammonia, BOD₅ (mass only), chlorine residual, copper, electrical conductivity, and TSS (mass only). The effluent limitations for these pollutants are less stringent than those in Order R5-2008-0156. This relaxation of effluent limitations is consistent with the anti-backsliding requirements of the CWA and federal regulations.

- a. **CWA section 402(o)(1) and 303(d)(4).** CWA section 402(o)(1) prohibits the establishment of less stringent WQBELs “except in compliance with Section 303(d)(4).” CWA section 303(d)(4) has two parts: paragraph (A) which applies to nonattainment waters and paragraph (B) which applies to attainment waters.
 - i. For waters where standards are not attained, CWA section 304(d)(4)(A) specifies that any effluent limit based on a TMDL or other WLA may be revised only if the cumulative effect of all such revised effluent limits based on such TMDLs or WLAs will assure the attainment of such water quality standards.
 - ii. For attainment waters, CWA section 303(d)(4)(B) specifies that a limitation based on a water quality standard may be relaxed where the action is consistent with the antidegradation policy.

Auburn Ravine Creek is considered an attainment water for aluminum, ammonia, BOD₅, chlorine residual, copper, electrical conductivity, and TSS because the receiving water is not listed as impaired on the 303(d) list for these constituents¹. As discussed in section IV.D.4, below, removal and relaxation of the effluent limits complies with federal and state antidegradation requirements. Thus, removal of the effluent limitations for aluminum, chlorine residual, copper, and electrical conductivity and relaxation of effluent limitations for ammonia, BOD₅ (mass only), and TSS (mass only) from Order R5-2008-0156 meets the exception in CWA section 303(d)(4)(B).

- b. **CWA section 402(o)(2).** CWA section 402(o)(2) provides several exceptions to the anti-backsliding regulations. CWA 402(o)(2)(B)(i) allows a renewed, reissued, or modified permit to contain a less stringent effluent limitation for a pollutant if information is available which was not available at the time of permit issuance (other than revised regulations, guidance, or test methods) and which would have justified the application of a less stringent effluent limitation at the time of permit issuance.

As described further in section IV.C.3.b of this Fact Sheet, updated information that was not available at the time Order R5-2008-0156 was issued indicates that aluminum, chlorine residual, copper, and electrical conductivity do not exhibit reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality

¹ “The exceptions in Section 303(d)(4) address both waters in attainment with water quality standards and those not in attainment, i.e. waters on the section 303(d) impaired waters list.” State Water Board Order WQ 2008-0006, Berry Petroleum Company, Poso Creek/McVan Facility.

objectives in the receiving water. The updated information that supports the removal of effluent limitations for these constituents includes the following:

- i. **Aluminum.** As discussed in Section IV.C.3 of the Fact Sheet, based on new aluminum toxicity studies developed by other dischargers in the Central Valley Region, the Central Valley Water Board finds that based on site-specific conditions of the Auburn Ravine Creek, the chronic criterion (87 µg/L) recommended in U.S. EPA's NAWQC for aluminum is not applicable and applied the acute criterion (750 µg/L) to interpret the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective. Effluent monitoring data collected between December 2008 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Secondary MCL of 200 µg/L or U.S.EPA's NAWQC criterion of 750 µg/L.
- ii. **Chlorine, Total Residual.** Chlorine is not used for disinfection or pathogen control processes at the Facility. Instead, the Facility utilizes a UV disinfection process. Therefore, the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the NAWQC or the Basin Plan's narrative toxicity objective.
- iii. **Copper.** The Discharger conducted a copper water effects ratio (WER) study during the term of the previous permit that indicated a dissolved WER for copper of 6.34 is appropriate and protective of the beneficial uses of the receiving water. Effluent data and receiving water monitoring collected between December 2008 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the CTR aquatic life criteria of 14 µg/L.
- iv. **Electrical Conductivity.** Effluent data and receiving water monitoring collected between December 2008 and March 2013 indicates that the discharge does not demonstrate reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of the Secondary MCL of 900 µmhos/cm.

Thus, removal of the effluent limitations for aluminum, chlorine residual, copper, and electrical conductivity from Order R5-2008-0156 is in accordance with CWA section 402(o)(2)(B)(i), which allows for the removal or relaxation of effluent limitations based on information that was not available at the time of permit issuance.

4. Antidegradation Policies

- a. **Surface Water.** Upon adoption of Order No. R5-2008-0156, the Discharger provided tertiary treatment for a design average dry weather flow of 4.2 MGD. The Discharger submitted an Antidegradation Analysis in the ROWD for Order R5-2008-0156 requesting an increase in the average dry weather flow up to 8.4 MGD, or some smaller increase, to accommodate local growth and regionalization. Order R5-2008-0156 specified that once the expansion and upgrade was complete and certified by a Registered Engineer, the Discharger would be authorized to discharge up to 8.4 MGD. An upgrade and expansion project is currently under construction and is planned to be completed by September 2015 to allow for regionalization with the Placer County SMD1 WWTP. The Discharger indicated in the ROWD that additional growth and regionalization projects may be necessary and requested the ability to increase the allowable flow up to 8.4 MGD in this Order. The Central Valley Water Board found in Order R5-2008-0156 that *"This Order provides for an increase in the volume and mass of pollutants discharged and is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Resources Control*

Board Resolution 68-16, and guidance provided in State Water Board Administrative Procedures Update (APU) No. 90-004.” Therefore, an increase in the permitted average dry weather discharge flow from 4.2 MGD up to 8.4 MGD was authorized under Order No. R5-2008-0156.

This Order does not allow for an increase in flow or mass of pollutants to the receiving water beyond that allowed by Order R5-2008-0156. Therefore, an additional antidegradation analysis is not necessary. The Order requires compliance with applicable federal technology-based standards and with WQBELs where the discharge could have the reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an exceedance of water quality standards. The permitted discharge is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16. Compliance with these requirements will result in the use of best practicable treatment or control of the discharge. The impact on existing water quality will be insignificant.

This Order removes existing effluent limitations for constituents in which updated monitoring data demonstrates that the effluent does not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the applicable water quality criteria or objectives in the receiving water (i.e., aluminum, chlorine residual, copper, and electrical conductivity). This Order relaxes the effluent limitations for ammonia by one significant figure to be consistent with the sensitivity of the analytical method used for ammonia. This Order also includes less stringent mass limitations for ammonia, BOD₅, and TSS based on the permitted average daily effluent flow as this Order allows discharges from the tertiary storage basins which may exceed the average dry weather flow and are necessary to prevent discharges during flood events or when discharges would not comply with the requirements of this Order (e.g., receiving water temperature limitations). The Central Valley Water Board finds that the removal of the effluent limitations for aluminum, chlorine residual, copper and electrical conductivity and the relaxation of effluent limitations for ammonia, BOD₅, and TSS does not result in an allowed increase in pollutants or any additional degradation of the receiving water. Thus, the removal of effluent limitations is consistent with the antidegradation provisions of 40 CFR 131.12 and State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16.

5. Stringency of Requirements for Individual Pollutants

This Order contains both technology-based effluent limitations and WQBELs for individual pollutants. The technology-based effluent limitations consist of restrictions on flow, BOD₅, and TSS. Restrictions on these parameters are discussed in section IV.B.2 of the Fact Sheet. This Order’s technology-based pollutant restrictions implement the minimum, applicable federal technology-based requirements. In addition, this Order contains effluent limitations more stringent than the minimum, federal technology-based requirements that are necessary to meet water quality standards.

WQBELs have been derived to implement water quality objectives that protect beneficial uses. Both the beneficial uses and the water quality objectives have been approved pursuant to federal law and are the applicable federal water quality standards. To the extent that toxic pollutant WQBELs were derived from the CTR, the CTR is the applicable standard pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.38. The procedures for calculating the individual WQBELs for priority pollutants are based on the CTR implemented by the SIP, which was approved by U.S. EPA on May 18, 2000. All beneficial uses and water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan were approved under state law and submitted to and approved by U.S. EPA prior to May 30, 2000. Any water quality objectives and beneficial uses submitted to U.S. EPA prior to May 30, 2000, but not

approved by U.S. EPA before that date, are nonetheless “applicable water quality standards for purposes of the CWA” pursuant to 40 C.F.R. section 131.21(c)(1). Collectively, this Order’s restrictions on individual pollutants are no more stringent than required to implement the requirements of the CWA.

This Order contains pollutant restrictions that are more stringent than applicable federal requirements and standards. Specifically, this Order includes effluent limitations for total coliform organisms that are more stringent than applicable federal standards, but that are nonetheless necessary to meet numeric objectives or protect beneficial uses. The rationale for including these limitations is explained in section IV.C.3 in this Fact Sheet. In addition, the Central Valley Water Board has considered the factors in Water Code section 13241 in IV.C.3 of this Fact Sheet.

**Summary of Final Effluent Limitations
Filter Clearwell and Discharge Point 001**

Table F-15. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations – Filter Clearwell Internal Waste Stream Compliance Point (Monitoring Location INT-001)

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis ¹
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum	
Average Dry Weather Flow	MGD	4.2 ²	--	--	--	--	DC
		5.9 ³	--	--	--	--	
		8.4 ⁴	--	--	--	--	
Conventional Pollutants							
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--	TTC
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	10	15	20	--	--	TTC
Non-Conventional Pollutants							
Total Coliform Organisms	MPN/100 mL	--	2.2 ⁵	23 ⁶	--	240	Title 22

¹ DC – Based on the design capacity of the Facility.
TTC – Based on tertiary treatment capability. These effluent limitations reflect the capability of a properly operated tertiary treatment plant.
Title 22 – Based on CA Department of Public Health Reclamation Criteria, CCR, Division 4, Chapter 3 (Title 22).

² Effective immediately and until compliance with Special Provision VI.C.6.b.i.

³ Effective upon compliance with Special Provision VI.C.6.b.i.

⁴ Effective upon compliance with Special Provisions VI.C.6.b.i and VI.C.6.b.ii.

⁵ Applied as a 7-day median effluent limitation.

⁶ Not to be exceeded more than once in any 30-day period.

Table F-16. Summary of Final Effluent Limitations – Discharge Point 001 (Monitoring Location EFF-001)

Parameter	Units	Effluent Limitations					Basis ¹
		Average Monthly	Average Weekly	Maximum Daily	Instantaneous Minimum	Instantaneous Maximum	
Average Daily Discharge Flow	MGD	--	--	12.2	--	--	DC
Conventional Pollutants							
Biochemical Oxygen Demand (5-day @ 20°C)	mg/L	30	45	60	--	--	CFR
	lbs/day ²	3,050	4,580	6,100	--	--	
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--	
pH	standard units	--	--	--	6.5	8.5	BP
Total Suspended Solids	mg/L	30	45	60	--	--	CFR
	lbs/day ²	3,050	4,580	6,100	--	--	
	% Removal	85	--	--	--	--	
Priority Pollutants							
Mercury, Total Recoverable	lbs/month	0.022 ³	--	--	--	--	PB
		0.0234 ⁴	--	--	--	--	
Non-Conventional Pollutants							
Ammonia, Total (as N)	mg/L	0.7	--	2.1	--	--	NAWQC
	lbs/day ²	71	--	214	--	--	
Acute Toxicity	% Survival	70 ⁵ /90 ⁶	--	--	--	--	BP
Chronic Toxicity	TUc	⁷	--	--	--	--	BP

¹ DC – Based on the design capacity of the Facility.

CFR – Based on secondary treatment standards contained in 40 CFR Part 133.

BP – Based on water quality objectives contained in the Basin Plan.

PB – Based on Facility performance.

NAWQC – Based on USEPA's National Ambient Water Quality Criteria for the protection of freshwater aquatic life.

MCL – Based on the Primary Maximum Contaminant Level.

² Based on the maximum hydraulic capacity of the Facility outfall of 12.2 MGD.

³ The total monthly mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.022 lbs/month. Effective immediately and until 1 September 2015.

⁴ The total monthly mass discharge of total mercury shall not exceed 0.0234 lbs/month. Effective 1 September 2015 and upon compliance with Special Provision VI.C.6.b.i.

⁵ 70 percent minimum of any one bioassay.

⁶ 90 percent median for any three consecutive bioassays.

⁷ There shall be no chronic toxicity in the effluent discharge.

E. Interim Effluent Limitations – Not Applicable

F. Land Discharge Specifications – Not Applicable

G. Recycling Specifications

Treated wastewater discharged for reclamation is regulated under separate waste discharge requirements contained in Order R5-2005-0040-01 (as amended by Order R5-2012-0052), or subsequent orders, and must meet the requirements of CCR, Title 22.

V. RATIONALE FOR RECEIVING WATER LIMITATIONS

A. Surface Water

1. CWA section 303(a-c), requires states to adopt water quality standards, including criteria where they are necessary to protect beneficial uses. The Central Valley Water Board adopted water quality criteria as water quality objectives in the Basin Plan. The Basin Plan states that “[t]he numerical and narrative water quality objectives define the least stringent standards that the Regional Water Board will apply to regional waters in order to protect the beneficial uses.” The Basin Plan includes numeric and narrative water quality objectives for various beneficial uses and water bodies. This Order contains receiving surface water limitations based on the Basin Plan numerical and narrative water quality objectives for bacteria, biostimulatory substances, color, chemical constituents, dissolved oxygen, floating material, oil and grease, pesticides, radioactivity, suspended sediment, settleable substances, suspended material, tastes and odors, and toxicity.
 - a. **Temperature.** At the time Orders 5-01-242 was adopted, the Discharger had not commenced discharges to Auburn Ravine Creek and compliance with receiving water limitations based on the Basin Plan objective of 5°F over natural background temperature was uncertain. Therefore, the Discharger requested site-specific receiving water limits and averaging periods for temperature, and provided studies demonstrating that the site-specific limits were equally protective of the Basin Plan objective, in the 2 May 2001 *City of Lincoln Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility Addendum to the Report of Waste Discharge* (Addendum).

In comments submitted in response to the Discharger's *Final Environmental Impact Report for the City of Lincoln Wastewater Treatment Plant Expansion to 2.4 Million Gallons per Day*, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) recommended the establishment of a 58° F monthly average and weekly median temperature limitations, which DFW stated would be protective of fishery resources (e.g., chinook salmon and steelhead trout) in Auburn Ravine Creek.

The 64°F daily maximum limit is based on results from Castelberry (1992)¹ indicating that growth rates for juvenile chinook salmon and steelhead are not adversely affected by temperatures up to the temperature level. Relative to lower water temperatures, critical swimming velocities were likewise unaffected. Finally, juvenile chinook salmon mortality released into the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta increased only at temperatures greater the 64°F. Therefore, a maximum daily temperature limitations of 64°F is protective against chronic adverse impacts on fishery resources.

The Discharger based its recommendation for a 5°F annual averaging period on the *California Regional Water Quality Control Board (2000) Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins for pH and Turbidity at Deer Creek El Dorado & Sacramento Counties, Staff Report, Volume II, Supporting Technical Information* which stated that “Rapid temperature increases of 9°F and greater would generally be expected to result in no significant adverse impacts to fish, unless the ultimate temperature reached is at or near the species upper incipient lethal limit.”

¹ Castelberry, D.T., J.J. Cech, M.K. Saiki, and B.A. Martin (1992) Growth, Condition, and Physiological Performance of Juvenile Salmonids for the Lower American River: February through July 1991. Final Report. East Bay Municipal Utility District. Oakland, CA.

The Discharger submitted a 4 September 2001 follow-up memo to the Addendum entitled *City of Lincoln Wastewater Discharge to Auburn Ravine* containing April 1999 to August 2000 receiving water temperature monitoring data in support of the claim that the receiving water temperature in May and October often exceeds 58°F, making compliance with the monthly average temperature infeasible.

Based on the information provided by the Discharger, the Central Valley Water Board staff established 58°F monthly average and weekly median limitations and incorporated the 5°F annual averaging period in Orders 5-01-242 and R5-2008-0156. The upgraded Facility has been online since 2004, and based on Facility operations utilizing the tertiary storage basins, the Discharger has demonstrated that it is able to comply with the Basin Plan objective on a consistent basis, with the downstream receiving water exceeding the upstream receiving water temperature by more than 5°F only once based on 1,051 samples collected between December 2008 and March 2013. Therefore, this Order replaces the site-specific temperature receiving water limitations with receiving water limitations based on the Basin Plan objective.

- b. **pH.** Order R5-2008-0156 established a receiving water limitation for pH specifying that discharges from the Facility shall not cause the ambient pH to change by more than 0.5 units based on the water quality objective for pH in the Basin Plan, and allowed an annual averaging period for calculating pH change. The Discharger proposed an annual averaging period for pH change in the 2 May 2001 *City of Lincoln Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility Addendum to the Report of Waste Discharge* (Addendum). In the Addendum, the Discharger cited the Central Valley Water Board's 2000 *Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins for pH and Turbidity at Deer Creek El Dorado & Sacramento Counties, Staff Report, Volume II, Supporting Technical Information* as the basis for proposing to assess compliance with the 0.5 change in pH on an average annual basis. DFW staff contributed to the pH studies in the Amendments. The Discharger's interpretation of the conclusion in the Amendments was that "[m]ortality does not appear to occur (unless specific rare species are present) until the pH is depressed below approximately 5.0 or increased above approximately 9.0." Central Valley Water Board staff incorporated the Discharger's proposed annual averaging basis into Orders 5-10-242 and R5-2008-0156.

The Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution R5-2007-0136 on 25 October 2007, amending the Basin Plan to delete the portion of the pH water quality objective that limits the change in pH to 0.5 units and the allowance of averaging periods for pH. The Basin Plan amendment has been approved by the State Water Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and USEPA. Consistent with the revised water quality objective in the Basin Plan, this Order does not require a receiving water limitation for pH change.

In Finding No. 14 of Resolution R5-2007-0136 the Central Valley Water Board found that the change in the pH receiving water objective is consistent with the State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, in that the changes to water quality objectives (i) consider maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR 131.12).

Ammonia is the only constituent in the discharge regulated by this Order directly related to pH. The fixed ammonia effluent limitations in this Order are based on

reasonable worse-case conditions. Although ammonia criteria are based on pH, and the pH receiving water limitations are more lenient in this Order than in the previous permit, the fixed ammonia limits are more stringent limits, and are developed to protect under worse-case pH conditions. Therefore the relaxation of the pH receiving water limitation will protect aquatic life and other beneficial uses and will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses nor result in water quality less than described in applicable policies. The relaxation of the receiving water limitation is not expected to cause other impacts on water quality. The Central Valley Water Board finds that the relaxation of the pH receiving water limitation (i) is to the maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR 131.12).

The revised receiving water limitation for pH, which is based on the amendment to the Basin Plan's pH water quality objective, reflects current scientifically supported pH requirements for the protection of aquatic life and other beneficial uses. The revised receiving water limitation for pH is more consistent with the current USEPA recommended criteria and is fully protective of aquatic life and the other beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan. Changes in pH when pH is maintained within the range of 6.5 to 8.5 are neither beneficial nor adverse and, therefore, are not considered to be degradation in water quality. Attempting to restrict pH changes to 0.5 pH units would incur substantial costs without demonstrable benefits to beneficial uses. Thus, any changes in pH that would occur under the revised pH limitation would not only be protective of beneficial uses, but also would be consistent with maximum benefit to people of the State. Therefore the proposed amendment will not violate antidegradation policies.

- c. **Turbidity.** The Discharger proposed an averaging period for turbidity where natural turbidity is between 0 and 5 NTUs in the 2 May 2001 *City of Lincoln Wastewater Treatment and Reclamation Facility Addendum to the Report of Waste Discharge* (Addendum). The Basin Plan allows for the application of appropriate averaging periods in determining compliance with turbidity limitations provided that beneficial uses are protected. The proposed site specific receiving water limitations were established in Order 5-01-242 and retained in Order R5-2008-0156.

The Central Valley Water Board's 2000 *Amendments to the Water Quality Control Plan for the Sacramento River and San Joaquin River Basins for pH and Turbidity at Deer Creek El Dorado & Sacramento Counties, Staff Report, Volume II, Supporting Technical Information* provided the basis for annual averaging period for turbidity. In the Addendum, the Discharger stated that normal turbidity measurements have been observed to range from 10-50 NTU under normal Auburn Ravine Creek stream flow conditions. DFW staff contributed to the turbidity studies in the Amendments. As such, the Discharger concluded that an increase in turbidity from 0.2 to 2 NTU would be a violation if the averaging period does not reflect the normal range and variability of ambient turbidity in Auburn Ravine Creek. Central Valley Water Board staff prepared Orders 5-01-242 and R5-2008-0156 to require annual averaging from 0 to 0.5 NTU and monitoring for specified increases over natural turbidity for higher ranges.

The Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution R5-2007-0136 on 25 October 2007, amending the Basin Plan to limit turbidity to 2 NTU when the natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU. The Basin Plan amendment has been approved by the State Water Board, the Office of Administrative Law, and USEPA. Consistent

with the revised water quality objective in the Basin Plan, this Order limits turbidity to 2 NTU when the natural turbidity is less than 1 NTU, but retains the annual averaging period for natural turbidity ranges between 0 and 1 NTU and 1 and 5 NTU.

In Finding No. 14 of Resolution R5-2007-0136 the Central Valley Water Board found that the change in the turbidity receiving water objective is consistent with the State Water Board Resolution No. 68-16, in that the changes to water quality objectives (i) consider maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR 131.12).

This Order includes operational specifications that require the Discharger to operate the treatment system to insure that turbidity shall not exceed 2 NTU as a daily average, and 5 NTU more than 5 percent of the time within a 24 hour period, and 10 NTU, at any time. Because this Order limits the average daily discharge of turbidity to 2 NTU, the Order will be protective of the receiving water under all natural background conditions as defined in the Basin Plan's revised water quality objective for turbidity. The relaxation of the turbidity receiving water limitation will protect aquatic life and other beneficial uses and will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial uses nor result in water quality less than described in applicable policies. The relaxation of the receiving water limitation is not expected to cause other impacts on water quality. The Central Valley Water Board finds that the relaxation of the turbidity receiving water limitation is to the maximum benefit to the people of the State, (ii) will not unreasonably affect present and anticipated beneficial use of waters, and (iii) will not result in water quality less than that prescribed in policies, and is consistent with the federal Antidegradation Policy (40 CFR 131.12).

The revised receiving water limitation for turbidity, which is based on the amendment to the Basin Plan's turbidity water quality objective, reflects current scientifically supported turbidity requirements for the protection of aquatic life and other beneficial uses and, therefore, will be fully protective of aquatic life and the other beneficial uses listed in the Basin Plan. Changes in turbidity allowed by the revised receiving water limitation, when ambient turbidity is below 1 NTU, would not adversely affect beneficial uses and would maintain water quality at a level higher than necessary to protect beneficial uses. Restricting low-level turbidity changes further may require costly upgrades, which would not provide any additional protection of beneficial uses. Thus, any changes in turbidity that would occur under the amended turbidity receiving water limitation would not only be protective of beneficial uses, but also would be consistent with maximum benefit to people of the State. Therefore, the relaxed receiving water limitations for turbidity will not violate antidegradation policies.

B. Groundwater

1. The beneficial uses of the underlying groundwater are municipal and domestic supply, industrial service supply, industrial process supply, and agricultural supply.
2. Waste discharge requirements for groundwater, including limitations and monitoring requirements, are regulated through Master Reclamation Permit R5-2005-0040-01 (as amended by Order R5-2012-0052), NPDES No. CA0085103.

VI. RATIONALE FOR PROVISIONS

A. Standard Provisions

Standard Provisions, which apply to all NPDES permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.41, and additional conditions applicable to specified categories of permits in accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 122.42, are provided in Attachment D. The discharger must comply with all standard provisions and with those additional conditions that are applicable under section 122.42.

Sections 122.41(a)(1) and (b) through (n) of 40 C.F.R. establish conditions that apply to all state-issued NPDES permits. These conditions must be incorporated into the permits either expressly or by reference. If incorporated by reference, a specific citation to the regulations must be included in the Order. Section 123.25(a)(12) of 40 C.F.R. allows the state to omit or modify conditions to impose more stringent requirements. In accordance with 40 C.F.R. section 123.25, this Order omits federal conditions that address enforcement authority specified in 40 C.F.R. sections 122.41(j)(5) and (k)(2) because the enforcement authority under the Water Code is more stringent. In lieu of these conditions, this Order incorporates by reference Water Code section 13387(e).

B. Special Provisions

1. Reopener Provisions

- a. **Mercury.** This provision allows the Central Valley Water Board to reopen this Order in the event mercury is found to be causing toxicity based on acute or chronic toxicity test results, or if a TMDL program is adopted. In addition, this Order may be reopened if the Central Valley Water Board determines that a mercury offset program is feasible for dischargers subject to NPDES permits.
- b. **Whole Effluent Toxicity.** This Order requires the Discharger to investigate the causes of, and identify corrective actions to reduce or eliminate effluent toxicity through a TRE. This Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation, a new acute toxicity limitation, and/or a limitation for a specific toxicant identified in the TRE. Additionally, if a numeric chronic toxicity water quality objective is adopted by the State Water Board, this Order may be reopened to include a numeric chronic toxicity limitation based on that objective.
- c. **Water Effects Ratio (WER) and Metal Translators.** A default WER of 1.0 has been used in this Order for calculating criteria for applicable inorganic constituents, with the exception of copper which utilizes a site-specific WER of 6.34. In addition, default dissolved-to-total metal translators have been used to convert water quality objectives from dissolved to total recoverable. If the Discharger performs studies to determine site-specific WERs and/or site-specific dissolved-to-total metal translators, this Order may be reopened to modify the effluent limitations for the applicable inorganic constituents.
- d. **Ultraviolet (UV) Disinfection Operating Specifications.** The UV operating specifications in this Order are based on the UV guidelines developed by the National Water Research Institute and American Water Works Association Research Foundation titled, "Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse." If the Discharger conducts a site-specific UV Engineering study that identifies site-specific UV operating specifications that will achieve the virus inactivation equivalent to Title 22 disinfected tertiary recycled water, this Order may be reopened to modify the UV operating specifications.

- e. **Drinking Water Policy.** On 26 July 2013 the Central Valley Water Board adopted Resolution No. R5-2013-0098 amending the Basin Plan and establishing a Drinking Water Policy. The State Water Board will consider adoption of the Drinking Water Policy at a future meeting. This Order may be reopened to incorporate monitoring of drinking water constituents to implement the Drinking Water Policy.
2. **Special Studies and Additional Monitoring Requirements**

- a. **Chronic Whole Effluent Toxicity Requirements.** The Basin Plan contains a narrative toxicity objective that states, “*All waters shall be maintained free of toxic substances in concentrations that produce detrimental physiological responses in human, plant, animal, or aquatic life.*” (Basin Plan at page III-8.00.) Based on whole effluent chronic toxicity testing performed by the Discharger from December 2008 through March 2013, the discharge has reasonable potential to cause or contribute to an in-stream excursion above of the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective.

The Monitoring and Reporting Program of this Order requires chronic WET monitoring for demonstration of compliance with the narrative toxicity objective. The provision also includes a numeric toxicity monitoring trigger, requirements for accelerated monitoring, and requirements for TRE initiation if toxicity is demonstrated.

Monitoring Trigger. A numeric toxicity monitoring trigger of > 1 TUc (where TUc = 100/NOEC) is applied in the provision, because this Order does not allow any dilution for the chronic condition. Therefore, a TRE is triggered when the effluent exhibits toxicity at 100% effluent.

Accelerated Monitoring. The provision requires accelerated WET testing when a regular WET test result exceeds the monitoring trigger. The purpose of accelerated monitoring is to determine, in an expedient manner, whether there is toxicity before requiring the implementation of a TRE. Due to possible seasonality of the toxicity, the accelerated monitoring should be performed in a timely manner, preferably taking no more than 2 to 3 months to complete.


The provision requires accelerated monitoring consisting of four chronic toxicity tests in a six-week period (i.e., one test every two weeks) using the species that exhibited toxicity. Guidance regarding accelerated monitoring and TRE initiation is provided in the *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991 (TSD). The TSD at page 118 states, “*EPA recommends if toxicity is repeatedly or periodically present at levels above effluent limits more than 20 percent of the time, a TRE should be required.*” Therefore, four accelerated monitoring tests are required in this provision. If no toxicity is demonstrated in the four accelerated tests, then it demonstrates that toxicity is not present at levels above the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time (only 1 of 5 tests are toxic, including the initial test). However, notwithstanding the accelerated monitoring results, if there is adequate evidence of effluent toxicity (i.e. toxicity present exceeding the monitoring trigger more than 20 percent of the time), the Executive Officer may require that the Discharger initiate a TRE.

See the WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart (Figure F-1), below, for further clarification of the accelerated monitoring requirements and for the decision points for determining the need for TRE initiation.

TRE Guidance. The Discharger is required to prepare a TRE Workplan in accordance with USEPA guidance. Numerous guidance documents are available, as identified below:

- *Toxicity Reduction Evaluation Guidance for Municipal Wastewater Treatment Plants*, EPA/833-B-99/002, August 1999.
- *Generalized Methodology for Conducting Industrial Toxicity Reduction Evaluations (TREs)*, EPA/600/2-88/070, April 1989.
- *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase I Toxicity Characterization Procedures, Second Edition*, EPA 600/6-91/003, February 1991.
- *Toxicity Identification Evaluation: Characterization of Chronically Toxic Effluents, Phase I*, EPA/600/6-91/005F, May 1992.
- *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase II Toxicity Identification Procedures for Samples Exhibiting Acute and Chronic Toxicity, Second Edition*, EPA/600/R-92/080, September 1993.
- *Methods for Aquatic Toxicity Identification Evaluations: Phase III Toxicity Confirmation Procedures for Samples Exhibiting Acute and Chronic Toxicity, Second Edition*, EPA 600/R-92/081, September 1993.
- *Methods for Measuring the Acute Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater and Marine Organisms, Fifth Edition*, EPA-821-R-02-012, October 2002.
- *Short-term Methods for Estimating the Chronic Toxicity of Effluents and Receiving Waters to Freshwater Organisms, Fourth Edition*, EPA-821-R-02-013, October 2002.
- *Technical Support Document for Water Quality-based Toxics Control*, EPA/505/2-90-001, March 1991.

**Figure F-1
 WET Accelerated Monitoring Flow Chart**



3. Best Management Practices and Pollution Prevention

- a. **Salinity Evaluation and Minimization Plan.** An Evaluation and Minimization Plan for salinity is required to be maintained in this Order to ensure adequate measures are developed and implemented by the Discharger to reduce the discharge of salinity to Auburn Ravine Creek.

4. Construction, Operation, and Maintenance Specifications

- a. **Filtration System Operating Specifications.** Turbidity is included as an operational specification as an indicator of the effectiveness of the filtration system for providing adequate disinfection. The tertiary treatment process utilized at this Facility is capable of reliably meeting a turbidity limitation of 2 NTU as a daily average. Failure of the treatment system such that virus removal is impaired would normally result in increased particles in the effluent, which result in higher effluent turbidity and could impact UV dosage. Turbidity has a major advantage for monitoring filter performance, allowing immediate detection of filter failure and rapid corrective action. The operational specification requires that turbidity prior to disinfection shall not exceed 2 NTU as a daily average; 5 NTU, more than 5 percent of the time within a 24-hour period, and an instantaneous maximum of 10 NTU.

- b. **Ultraviolet Light (UV) Disinfection System Operating Specifications.** This Order requires that wastewater shall be oxidized, coagulated, filtered, and adequately disinfected pursuant to the DPH reclamation criteria, CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 3, (Title 22), or equivalent. To ensure that the UV disinfection system is operated to achieve the required pathogen removal, this Order includes effluent limits for total coliform organisms, filtration system operating specifications, and UV disinfection system operating specifications. Compliance with total coliform effluent limits alone does not ensure that pathogens in the municipal wastewater have been deactivated by the UV disinfection system. Compliance with the effluent limits and the filtration system and UV disinfection operating specifications demonstrates compliance with the equivalency to Title 22 disinfection requirement.

The NWRI/AWWRF's "*Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse*" first published in December 2000 and revised as a Third Edition dated August 2012 (NWRI guidelines) includes UV operating specifications for compliance with Title 22. For water recycling in accordance with Title 22, the UV system shall be an approved system included in the *Treatment Technology Report for Recycled Water*, December 2009 (or a later version, as applicable) published by the DPH. The UV system shall also conform to all requirements and operating specifications of the NWRI guidelines, unless otherwise approved by DPH. A Memorandum dated 1 November 2004 issued by DPH to Regional Water Board executive offices recommended that provisions be included in permits for water recycling treatment plants employing UV disinfection requiring Dischargers to establish fixed cleaning frequency of lamp sleeves, as well as, include provisions that specify minimum delivered UV dose that must be maintained (per the NWRI Guidelines).

For granular media filtration, the NWRI guidelines recommend a minimum hourly average UV dose of 100 mJ/cm². Therefore, this Order includes UV operating specifications requiring a minimum hourly average UV dose of 100 mJ/cm², per the NWRI Guidelines.

- c. **Operating Requirements.** Consistent with Order R5-2008-0156, this Order includes operating requirements to prevent inundation or washout due to floods with

a 100-year return frequency, preclude public contact with wastewater, and prevent breeding of mosquitos.

5. Special Provisions for Municipal Facilities (POTWs Only)

a. Pretreatment Requirements

- i. 40 CFR 403.8(a) requires POTWs with a total design flow greater than 5 MGD and receiving pollutants which pass through or interfere with the operation of the POTW to establish a POTW Pretreatment Program. Order R5-2008-0156 authorized an expansion of the Facility to provide treatment for up to 8.4 MGD and required the Discharger to implement an Industrial Pretreatment Program upon the wastewater treatment plant being rated as having greater than 5.0 MGD capacity. The Discharger did not complete the expansion of the Facility during the term of Order R5-2008-0156, but is scheduled to complete a regionalization project in September 2015 which will increase the treatment capacity to 5.9 MGD to accommodate flows from the Placer County SMD1 WWTP. USEPA Region 9 staff conducted inspections of significant industrial users (SIUs) and metal finishing operations within the Placer County SMD1 WWTP's service area in May 2003. As a result of those inspections two industrial users were issued Findings of Violation and Administrative Orders, while another was issued a Request for Information and Self-Monitoring Order. Other industries were identified within the Placer County SMD1 WWTP's service area that may discharge constituents of concern. Consequently, Order R5-2010-0092 for the Placer County SMD1 WWTP required them to implement an Industrial Pretreatment Program. As the Facility will be have a flow greater than 5 MGD and will accept industrial wastes from the Placer County SMD1 WWTP service area upon completion of the regionalization project, this Order retains the requirement to implement a pretreatment program upon completion of the regionalization project with the Placer County SMD1 WWTP.
- ii. The federal CWA section 307(b), and federal regulations, 40 CFR Part 403, require POTWS to develop an acceptable industrial pretreatment program. A pretreatment program is required to prevent the introduction of pollutants, which will interfere with treatment plant operations or sludge disposal, and prevent pass through of pollutants that exceed water quality objectives, standards or permit limitations. Pretreatment requirements are imposed pursuant to 40 CFR Part 403.
- iii. The Discharger shall implement and enforce its approved pretreatment program and is an enforceable condition of this Order. If the Discharger fails to perform the pretreatment functions, the Central Valley Water Board, the State Water Board or USEPA may take enforcement actions against the Discharger as authorized by the CWA.

- b. The State Water Board issued General Waste Discharge Requirements for Sanitary Sewer Systems, Water Quality Order 2006-0003-DWQ (General Order) on 2 May 2006. The Monitoring and Reporting Requirements for the General Order were amended by Water Quality Order WQ 2008-0002-EXEC on 20 February 2008. The General Order requires public agencies that own or operate sanitary sewer systems with greater than one mile of pipes or sewer lines to enroll for coverage under the General Order. The General Order requires agencies to develop sanitary sewer management plans (SSMPs) and report all sanitary sewer overflows (SSOs), among other requirements and prohibitions.

Furthermore, the General Order contains requirements for operation and maintenance of collection systems and for reporting and mitigating sanitary sewer overflows. The Discharger is enrolled under State Water Board General Order No. 2006-003-DWQ.

- c. Limited portions of the wastewater collection system may be outside the service area of the Discharger. In order to assure compliance with Discharge Prohibitions against overflows and bypasses, and to assure protection of the entire collection system and treatment works from industrial discharges, it is necessary that the Discharger control discharges into the system. To control discharges into the entire collection system, this Order requires the Discharger to establish interagency agreements with the collection system users. The interagency agreements shall contain, at a minimum, requirements for reporting of unauthorized releases of wastewater, maintenance of the collection system, backup power or adequate wet well capacity at all pump stations to prevent overflows during power outages and pump failures, and pump station high water alarm notification systems. The agreements shall also require implementation of an industrial pretreatment program that meets the minimum requirements of this permit.

6. Other Special Provisions

- a. Consistent with Order R5-2008-0156, this Order requires wastewater to be oxidized, coagulated, filtered, and adequately disinfected pursuant to DPH reclamation criteria, CCR, Title 22, division 4, chapter 3 (Title 22), or equivalent.
- b. **Facility Expansion.** The Discharger is currently planning to expand the Facility to accommodate regionalization with Placer County SMD1 WWTP, which will increase the design average dry weather flow treatment capacity of the Facility to 5.9 MGD and the outfall hydraulic capacity to 19 MGD. Consistent with CDO R5-2010-0093-01 for the Placer County SMD1 WWTP, this Order requires completion of construction of the regional pipeline and expansion of the Facility by 1 September 2015. Once completed, the authorized discharge flow rate for the Facility shall increase to an average dry weather capacity of 5.9 MGD.

Prior to the adoption of Order R5-2008-0156 (and as documented in the Section IV.D.4 of Order R5-2008-0156) the Discharger completed an anti-degradation analysis consistent with an increase in regulated capacity up to an average dry weather flow capacity of 8.4 MGD. Subsequent to completion of all additional Facility upgrades necessary to develop such tertiary treatment capacity and certification by a registered and licensed Civil Engineer, the Discharger is authorized to discharge at a certified average dry weather flow capacity, not to exceed 8.4 MGD.

7. Compliance Schedules – Not Applicable

VII. RATIONALE FOR MONITORING AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

Section 122.48 of 40 C.F.R. requires that all NPDES permits specify requirements for recording and reporting monitoring results. Water Code sections 13267 and 13383 authorize the Central Valley Water Board to require technical and monitoring reports. The Monitoring and Reporting Program (MRP), Attachment E, establishes monitoring and reporting requirements that implement federal and state requirements. The following provides the rationale for the monitoring and reporting requirements contained in the MRP for this facility.

A. Influent Monitoring

1. Influent monitoring is required to collect data on the characteristics of the wastewater and to assess compliance with effluent limitations (e.g., BOD₅ and TSS reduction requirements). The monitoring frequency for flow (continuous) has been retained from Order R5-2008-0156.
2. Order R5-2008-0156 required daily monitoring for BOD₅ and TSS. The monitoring frequencies for BOD₅ and TSS have been reduced to five times per week. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is adequate to assess compliance with effluent limitations and monitor the performance of the Facility.
3. Order R5-2008-0156 required monitoring for electrical conductivity, pH, ammonia, and priority pollutants. Monitoring requirements for these constituents have not been retained from Order R5-2008-0156 as monitoring is not necessary to determine compliance with permit requirements.

B. Effluent Monitoring

1. Pursuant to the requirements of 40 CFR 122.44(i)(2) effluent monitoring is required for all constituents with effluent limitations. Effluent monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with effluent limitations, assess the effectiveness of the treatment process, and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream and groundwater.
2. **Monitoring Location INT-001**
 - a. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types at Monitoring Location INT-001 for BOD₅ (daily), total coliform organisms (daily), and TSS (daily) have been retained from Order R5-2008-0156 to determine compliance with effluent limitations for these parameters.
 - b. This Order includes an average dry weather flow limitation, compliance with which is required at the filter clearwell. Therefore, this Order establishes flow monitoring at Monitoring Location INT-001.
3. **Monitoring Location EFF-001**
 - a. Effluent monitoring frequencies and sample types at Monitoring Location EFF-001 for flow (continuous), ammonia (daily), BOD₅ (daily), chlorine residual (daily during use), dissolved oxygen (daily), electrical conductivity (weekly), hardness (three times per week), mercury (quarterly), pH (daily), temperature (daily), total dissolved solids (monthly), and TSS (daily) have been retained from Order R5-2008-0156 to determine compliance with effluent limitations for these parameters.
 - b. Monitoring data collected over the term of Order R5-2008-0156 for aluminum, copper, methylmercury did not demonstrate reasonable potential to exceed water quality objectives/criteria. Thus, specific monitoring requirements for these parameters have not been retained from Order R5-2008-0156.
 - c. In accordance with Section 1.3 of the SIP, periodic monitoring is required for priority pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established. Consistent with Order R5-2008-0156, this Order requires effluent monitoring for priority pollutants quarterly during the third year of the permit term. See Attachment I for more detailed requirements related to performing priority pollutant monitoring.
 - d. California Water Code section 13176, subdivision (a), states: "*The analysis of any material required by [Water Code sections 13000-16104] shall be performed by a laboratory that has accreditation or certification pursuant to Article 3 (commencing with Section 100825) of Chapter 4 of Part 1 of Division 101 of the Health and Safety*

Code.” DPH certifies laboratories through its Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Program (ELAP).

Section 13176 cannot be interpreted in a manner that would violate federal holding time requirements that apply to NPDES permits pursuant to the Clean Water Act. (Wat. Code §§ 13370, subd. (c), 13372, 13377.) Section 13176 is inapplicable to NPDES permits to the extent it is inconsistent with Clean Water Act requirements. (Wat. Code § 13372, subd. (a).) The holding time requirements are 15 minutes for chlorine residual, dissolved oxygen, and pH, and immediate analysis is required for temperature. (40 C.F.R. § 136.3(e), Table II) An on-site laboratory (ELAP Certificate No. 2587, expires 31 August 2014) conducts analyses for these constituents.

C. Whole Effluent Toxicity Testing Requirements

1. **Acute Toxicity.** Consistent with Order R5-2008-0156, quarterly 96-hour bioassay testing is required to demonstrate compliance with the effluent limitation for acute toxicity. As described in Section II.A of the Fact Sheet, there may be periods where no discharge to Auburn Ravine Creek occurs, most often during spring and summer months when the Discharger diverts tertiary treated effluent to the tertiary storage basins to store recycled water, store final effluent during downstream flood events, and/or to store effluent that does not meet permit requirements (e.g., receiving water temperature limits). Therefore, the Discharger is not required to perform testing during calendar-quarters when no discharge to Auburn Ravine Creek occurs.
2. **Chronic Toxicity.** Consistent with Order R5-2008-0156, quarterly chronic whole effluent toxicity testing is required in order to demonstrate compliance with the Basin Plan’s narrative toxicity objective. As described in Section II.A of the Fact Sheet, there may be periods where no discharge to Auburn Ravine Creek occurs, most often during spring and summer months when the Discharger diverts tertiary treated effluent to the tertiary storage basins to store recycled water, store final effluent during downstream flood events, and/or to store effluent that does not meet permit requirements (e.g., receiving water temperature limits). Consistent with Order R5-2008-0156, the Discharger is not required to perform testing during calendar-quarters when no discharge to Auburn Ravine Creek occurs.

D. Receiving Water Monitoring

1. Surface Water

- a. Receiving water monitoring is necessary to assess compliance with receiving water limitations and to assess the impacts of the discharge on the receiving stream.
- b. The receiving water monitoring frequency and sample type for dissolved oxygen (daily), fecal coliform organisms (quarterly), pH (daily), electrical conductivity (weekly), temperature (daily), and turbidity (daily) have been retained from Order R5-2008-0156.
- c. This Order reduces the monitoring frequency for hardness to monthly. The Central Valley Water Board finds that this frequency is adequate to characterize the receiving water.
- d. Order R5-2008-0156 required daily monitoring for flow and monthly monitoring for ammonia. Monitoring requirements for flow and ammonia have not been retained from Order R5-2008-0156 as monitoring is not necessary to determine compliance with permit requirements.

- e. In accordance with Section 1.3 of the SIP, periodic monitoring for priority pollutants for which criteria or objectives apply and for which no effluent limitations have been established. This Order requires monitoring for priority pollutants and other pollutants of concern quarterly during the third year of the permit term, concurrent with effluent monitoring, in order to collect data to conduct an RPA for the next permit renewal. See Attachment I for more detailed requirements related to performing priority pollutant monitoring.

2. Groundwater – Not Applicable

E. Other Monitoring Requirements

1. Sewage sludge Monitoring

Sewage sludge monitoring is required to ensure compliance with the sewage sludge disposal requirements contained in the Special Provision contained in section VI.C.5.b. of this Order. Sewage sludge disposal requirements are imposed pursuant to 40 CFR Part 503 to protect public health and prevent groundwater degradation. Upon completion of the regionalization project with the Placer County SMD1 WWTP, the Facility will have a design flow exceeding 5 MGD and will be accepting industrial wastewater from users within the Placer County SMD1 service area. Therefore, this Order requires the Discharger to ensure that industrial dischargers are not discharging pollutants to the Facility that may contaminate the sewage sludge.

2. Water Supply Monitoring

Water supply monitoring is required to evaluate the source of constituents in the wastewater. Consistent with Order R5-2008-0156, this Order requires quarterly monitoring for electrical conductivity and annual monitoring for standard minerals.

3. UV Disinfection System Monitoring

UV system monitoring and reporting are required to ensure that the UV system is operated to adequately inactivate pathogens in the wastewater. UV Disinfection system monitoring is imposed to achieve equivalency to requirements established by DPH, and the NWRI/AWWARF's "*Ultraviolet Disinfection Guidelines for Drinking Water and Water Reuse.*"

VIII. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

The Central Valley Water Board has considered the issuance of WDRs that will serve as an NPDES permit for City of Lincoln, Wastewater Treatment and Water Reclamation Facility. As a step in the WDR adoption process, the Central Valley Water Board staff has developed tentative WDRs and has encouraged public participation in the WDR adoption process.

A. Notification of Interested Parties

The Central Valley Water Board notified the Discharger and interested agencies and persons of its intent to prescribe WDRs for the discharge and provided an opportunity to submit written comments and recommendations. Notification was provided through a notice in the 12 December 2013 Lincoln News Messenger and a 2 December 2013 posting at City Hall.

The public had access to the agenda and any changes in dates and locations through the Central Valley Water Board's website at:

<http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/centralvalley/>

B. Written Comments

Interested persons were invited to submit written comments concerning tentative WDRs as provided through the notification process. Comments were due either in person or by mail to the Executive Office at the Central Valley Water Board at the address on the cover page of this Order.

To be fully responded to by staff and considered by the Central Valley Water Board, the written comments were due at the Central Valley Water Board office by **5:00 p.m. on 26 December 2013.**

C. Public Hearing

The Central Valley Water Board held a public hearing on the tentative WDRs during its regular Board meeting on the following date and time and at the following location:

Date: **6/7 February 2014**
Time: 8:30 a.m.
Location: Regional Water Quality Control Board, Central Valley Region
11020 Sun Center Dr., Suite #200
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670

Interested persons were invited to attend. At the public hearing, the Central Valley Water Board heard testimony pertinent to the discharge, WDRs, and permit. For accuracy of the record, important testimony was requested in writing.

D. Reconsideration of Waste Discharge Requirements

Any aggrieved person may petition the State Water Board to review the decision of the Central Valley Water Board regarding the final WDRs. The petition must be received by the State Water Board at the following address within 30 calendar days of the Central Valley Water Board's action:

State Water Resources Control Board
Office of Chief Counsel
P.O. Box 100, 1001 I Street
Sacramento, CA 95812-0100

For instructions on how to file a petition for review, see http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/public_notices/petitions/water_quality/wqpetition_instr.shtml

E. Information and Copying

The ROWD, other supporting documents, and comments received are on file and may be inspected at the address above at any time between 8:30 a.m. and 4:45 p.m., Monday through Friday. Copying of documents may be arranged through the Central Valley Water Board by calling (916) 464-3291.

F. Register of Interested Persons

Any person interested in being placed on the mailing list for information regarding the WDRs and NPDES permit should contact the Central Valley Water Board, reference this facility, and provide a name, address, and phone number.

G. Additional Information

Requests for additional information or questions regarding this order should be directed to Brian Taylor at (916) 464-4662.

ATTACHMENT G – SUMMARY OF REASONABLE POTENTIAL ANALYSIS FOR CONSTITUENTS OF CONCERN

Constituent	Units	MEC	B	C	CMC	CCC	Water & Org	Org. Only	Basin Plan	MCL	Reasonable Potential
Aluminum, Total Recoverable	µg/L	76 ¹	317 ¹	200	750 ²	--	--	--	--	200	No
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	0.58	0.071	2.14	2.14 ²	2.53 ³	--	--	--	--	Yes
Bis (2-Ethylhexyl) Phthalate	µg/L	<1.3	<1.3	1.8	--	--	1.8	5.9	--	4	No
Chloride	mg/L	69	7.8	230	860 ²	230 ⁴	--	--	--	250	No
Copper, Total Recoverable	µg/L	3.31	4.9	38 ⁵ /14 ⁶	55 ⁵ /18 ⁶	38 ⁵ /14 ⁶	1,300	--	--	1,000	No
Electrical Conductivity @ 25°C	µmhos/cm	479 ¹	138 ¹	900	--	--	--	--	--	900	No
Mercury, Total Recoverable	µg/L	0.0006	NA	0.050	--	--	0.050	0.051	--	2	Yes
Sulfate	mg/L	29 ¹	11 ¹	250	--	--	--	--	--	250	No
Total Dissolved Solids	mg/L	296 ¹	NA	500	--	--	--	--	--	500	No

General Note: All inorganic concentrations are given as a total recoverable.

MEC = Maximum Effluent Concentration

B = Maximum Receiving Water Concentration or lowest detection level, if non-detect

C = Criterion used for Reasonable Potential Analysis

CMC = Criterion Maximum Concentration (CTR or NTR)

CCC = Criterion Continuous Concentration (CTR or NTR)

Water & Org = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Water & Organisms (CTR or NTR)

Org. Only = Human Health Criterion for Consumption of Organisms Only (CTR or NTR)

Basin Plan = Numeric Site-specific Basin Plan Water Quality Objective

MCL = Drinking Water Standards Maximum Contaminant Level

NA = Not Available

ND = Non-detect

Footnotes:

- (1) Represents the maximum observed annual average concentration for comparison to the MCL.
- (2) USEPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 1-hour average.
- (3) USEPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 30-day average.
- (4) USEPA National Recommended Ambient Water Quality Criteria, Freshwater Aquatic Life Protection, 4-day average.
- (5) Criteria to be compared to the MEC.
- (6) Criteria to be compared to the upstream receiving water concentration.

ATTACHMENT H – CALCULATION OF WQBELS

Parameter	Units	Most Stringent Criteria			HH Calculations ¹				Aquatic Life Calculations ¹										Final Effluent Limitations	
		HH	CMC	CCC	ECA _{HH} = AMEL _{HH}	AMEL/MDEL Multiplier _{HH}	MDEL _{HH}	ECA _{acute}	ECA Multiplier _{acute}	LTA _{acute}	ECA _{chronic}	ECA Multiplier _{chronic}	LTA _{chronic}	Lowest LTA	AMEL Multiplier ₉₅	AMEL _{AL}	MDEL Multiplier ₉₉	MDEL _{AL}	Lowest AMEL	Lowest MDEL
Ammonia Nitrogen, Total (as N)	mg/L	--	2.14	2.53	--	--	--	2.14	0.14	0.30	2.53	0.55	1.39	0.30	2.43	0.7	7.08	2.1	0.7	2.1

¹ As described in section IV.C.2.c of the Fact Sheet (Attachment F), calculation of effluent limitations for the protection of human health and aquatic life are determined without the allowance of dilution credits.

ATTACHMENT I – EFFLUENT AND RECEIVING WATER CHARACTERIZATION STUDY

- I. **Background.** Sections 2.4.1 through 2.4.4 of the SIP provide minimum standards for analyses and reporting. (Copies of the SIP may be obtained from the State Water Resources Control Board, or downloaded from <http://www.waterboards.ca.gov/iswp/index.html>). To implement the SIP, effluent and receiving water data are needed for all priority pollutants. Effluent and receiving water pH and hardness are required to evaluate the toxicity of certain priority pollutants (such as heavy metals) where the toxicity of the constituents varies with pH and/or hardness. Section 3 of the SIP prescribes mandatory monitoring of dioxin congeners. In addition to specific requirements of the SIP, the Central Valley Water Board is requiring the following monitoring:
- A. **Drinking water constituents.** Constituents for which drinking water Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCLs) have been prescribed in the California Code of Regulation are included in the *Water Quality Control Plan, Fourth Edition, for the Sacramento and San Joaquin River Basins* (Basin Plan). The Basin Plan defines virtually all surface waters within the Central Valley Region as having existing or potential beneficial uses for municipal and domestic supply. The Basin Plan further requires that, at a minimum, water designated for use as domestic or municipal supply shall not contain concentrations of chemical constituents in excess of the MCLs contained in the California Code of Regulations.
 - B. **Effluent and receiving water temperature.** This is both a concern for application of certain temperature-sensitive constituents, such as fluoride, and for compliance with the Basin Plan's thermal discharge requirements.
 - C. **Effluent and receiving water hardness and pH.** These are necessary because several of the CTR constituents are hardness and pH dependent.
- II. **Monitoring Requirements**
- A. **Quarterly Monitoring.** Quarterly priority pollutant samples shall be collected from the effluent and upstream receiving water (Monitoring Locations EFF-001 and RSW-001) and analyzed for the constituents listed in Table I-1. Quarterly monitoring shall be conducted for 1 year (4 consecutive samples, evenly distributed throughout the year) and the results of such monitoring be submitted to the Central Valley Water Board, during the fourth year of the permit term. Each individual monitoring event shall provide representative sample results for the effluent and upstream receiving water.
 - D. **Concurrent Sampling.** Effluent and receiving water sampling shall be performed at approximately the same time, on the same date.
 - E. **Sample type.** All effluent samples shall be taken as grab samples. All receiving water samples shall be taken as grab samples, unless not appropriate to meet analytical holding time requirements per 40 CFR 136. The effluent sample collection type and rationale shall be defined in the study work plan.
 - F. **Additional Monitoring/Reporting Requirements.** The Discharger shall conduct the monitoring and reporting in accordance with the General Monitoring Provisions and Reporting Requirements in Attachment E.

Table I-1. Priority Pollutants and Other Constituents of Concern

CTR #	Constituent	CAS Number	Maximum Reporting Level ¹ µg/L or noted
28	1,1-Dichloroethane	75343	1
30	1,1-Dichloroethene	75354	0.5
41	1,1,1-Trichloroethane	71556	2
42	1,1,2-Trichloroethane	79005	0.5
37	1,1,2,2-Tetrachloroethane	79345	0.5
75	1,2-Dichlorobenzene	95501	2
29	1,2-Dichloroethane	107062	0.5
	cis-1,2-Dichloroethene	156592	
31	1,2-Dichloropropane	78875	0.5
101	1,2,4-Trichlorobenzene	120821	1
76	1,3-Dichlorobenzene	541731	2
32	1,3-Dichloropropene	542756	0.5
77	1,4-Dichlorobenzene	106467	2
17	Acrolein	107028	2
18	Acrylonitrile	107131	2
19	Benzene	71432	0.5
20	Bromoform	75252	2
34	Bromomethane	74839	2
21	Carbon tetrachloride	56235	0.5
22	Chlorobenzene (mono chlorobenzene)	108907	2
24	Chloroethane	75003	2
25	2- Chloroethyl vinyl ether	110758	1
26	Chloroform	67663	2
35	Chloromethane	74873	2
23	Dibromochloromethane	124481	0.5
27	Dichlorobromomethane	75274	0.5
36	Dichloromethane	75092	2
33	Ethylbenzene	100414	2
88	Hexachlorobenzene	118741	1
89	Hexachlorobutadiene	87683	1
91	Hexachloroethane	67721	1
94	Naphthalene	91203	10
38	Tetrachloroethene	127184	0.5

¹ The reporting levels required in these tables for priority pollutant constituents are established based on Section 2.4.2 and Appendix 4 of the SIP.

CTR #	Constituent	CAS Number	Maximum Reporting Level ¹ µg/L or noted
39	Toluene	108883	2
40	trans-1,2-Dichloroethylene	156605	1
43	Trichloroethene	79016	2
44	Vinyl chloride	75014	0.5
	Methyl-tert-butyl ether (MTBE)	1634044	
	Trichlorofluoromethane	75694	
	1,1,2-Trichloro-1,2,2-Trifluoroethane	76131	
	Styrene	100425	
	Xylenes	1330207	
60	1,2-Benzanthracene	56553	5
85	1,2-Diphenylhydrazine	122667	1
45	2-Chlorophenol	95578	5
46	2,4-Dichlorophenol	120832	5
47	2,4-Dimethylphenol	105679	2
49	2,4-Dinitrophenol	51285	5
82	2,4-Dinitrotoluene	121142	5
55	2,4,6-Trichlorophenol	88062	10
83	2,6-Dinitrotoluene	606202	5
50	2-Nitrophenol	25154557	10
71	2-Chloronaphthalene	91587	10
78	3,3'-Dichlorobenzidine	91941	5
62	3,4-Benzofluoranthene	205992	10
52	4-Chloro-3-methylphenol	59507	5
48	4,6-Dinitro-2-methylphenol	534521	10
51	4-Nitrophenol	100027	10
69	4-Bromophenyl phenyl ether	101553	10
72	4-Chlorophenyl phenyl ether	7005723	5
56	Acenaphthene	83329	1
57	Acenaphthylene	208968	10
58	Anthracene	120127	10
59	Benzidine	92875	5
61	Benzo(a)pyrene (3,4-Benzopyrene)	50328	2
63	Benzo(g,h,i)perylene	191242	5
64	Benzo(k)fluoranthene	207089	2
65	Bis(2-chloroethoxy) methane	111911	5
66	Bis(2-chloroethyl) ether	111444	1

CTR #	Constituent	CAS Number	Maximum Reporting Level ¹ µg/L or noted
67	Bis(2-chloroisopropyl) ether	39638329	10
68	Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate ²	117817	5
70	Butyl benzyl phthalate	85687	10
73	Chrysene	218019	5
81	Di-n-butylphthalate	84742	10
84	Di-n-octylphthalate	117840	10
74	Dibenzo(a,h)-anthracene	53703	0.1
79	Diethyl phthalate	84662	10
80	Dimethyl phthalate	131113	10
86	Fluoranthene	206440	10
87	Fluorene	86737	10
90	Hexachlorocyclopentadiene	77474	5
92	Indeno(1,2,3-c,d)pyrene	193395	0.05
93	Isophorone	78591	1
98	N-Nitrosodiphenylamine	86306	1
96	N-Nitrosodimethylamine	62759	5
97	N-Nitrosodi-n-propylamine	621647	5
95	Nitrobenzene	98953	10
53	Pentachlorophenol	87865	1
99	Phenanthrene	85018	5
54	Phenol	108952	1
100	Pyrene	129000	10
	Aluminum	7429905	
1	Antimony	7440360	5
2	Arsenic	7440382	10
15	Asbestos	1332214	
	Barium	7440393	
3	Beryllium	7440417	2
4	Cadmium	7440439	0.5
5a	Chromium (III)	7440473	50
5b	Chromium (VI)	18540299	10
6	Copper	7440508	10
14	Cyanide	57125	5
	Fluoride	7782414	
	Iron	7439896	
7	Lead	7439921	0.5

CTR #	Constituent	CAS Number	Maximum Reporting Level ¹ µg/L or noted
8	Mercury	7439976	0.5
	Manganese	7439965	
	Molybdenum	7439987	
9	Nickel	7440020	5
10	Selenium	7782492	5
11	Silver	7440224	0.25
12	Thallium	7440280	1
	Tributyltin	688733	
13	Zinc	7440666	20
110	4,4'-DDD	72548	0.05
109	4,4'-DDE	72559	0.05
108	4,4'-DDT	50293	0.01
112	alpha-Endosulfan	959988	0.02
103	alpha-Hexachlorocyclohexane (BHC)	319846	0.01
	Alachlor	15972608	
102	Aldrin	309002	0.005
113	beta-Endosulfan	33213659	0.01
104	beta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	319857	0.005
107	Chlordane	57749	0.1
106	delta-Hexachlorocyclohexane	319868	0.005
111	Dieldrin	60571	0.01
114	Endosulfan sulfate	1031078	0.05
115	Endrin	72208	0.01
116	Endrin Aldehyde	7421934	0.01
117	Heptachlor	76448	0.01
118	Heptachlor Epoxide	1024573	0.01
105	Lindane (gamma-Hexachlorocyclohexane)	58899	0.02
119	PCB-1016	12674112	0.5
120	PCB-1221	11104282	0.5
121	PCB-1232	11141165	0.5
122	PCB-1242	53469219	0.5
123	PCB-1248	12672296	0.5
124	PCB-1254	11097691	0.5
125	PCB-1260	11096825	0.5
126	Toxaphene	8001352	0.5
	Atrazine	1912249	

CTR #	Constituent	CAS Number	Maximum Reporting Level ¹ µg/L or noted
	Bentazon	25057890	
	Carbofuran	1563662	
	2,4-D	94757	
	Dalapon	75990	
	1,2-Dibromo-3-chloropropane (DBCP)	96128	
	Di(2-ethylhexyl)adipate	103231	
	Dinoseb	88857	
	Diquat	85007	
	Endothal	145733	
	Ethylene Dibromide	106934	
	Glyphosate	1071836	
	Methoxychlor	72435	
	Molinate (Ordram)	2212671	
	Oxamyl	23135220	
	Picloram	1918021	
	Simazine (Princep)	122349	
	Thiobencarb	28249776	
16	2,3,7,8-TCDD (Dioxin)	1746016	
	2,4,5-TP (Silvex)	93765	
	Diazinon	333415	0.015 µg/L*
	Diuron		0.05 µg/L
	Chlorpyrifos	2921882	0.014 µg/L*
	Ammonia (as N)	7664417	
	Boron	7440428	
	Chloride	16887006	
	Flow		
	Hardness (as CaCO ₃)		
	Foaming Agents (MBAS)		
	Mercury, Methyl	22967926	0.06 ng/L*
	Nitrate (as N)	14797558	2,000
	Nitrite (as N)	14797650	400
	pH		0.1
	Phosphorus, Total (as P)	7723140	
	Specific conductance (EC)		
	Sulfate		500
	Sulfide (as S)		

CTR #	Constituent	CAS Number	Maximum Reporting Level ¹ µg/L or noted
	Sulfite (as SO ₃)		
	Temperature		
	Total Dissolved Solids (TDS)		

² In order to verify if bis (2-ethylhexyl) phthalate is truly present in the effluent and receiving water, the Discharger shall take steps to assure that sample containers, sampling apparatus, and analytical equipment are not sources of the detected contaminant.

*Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL) for this constituent, which requires a maximum RL to determine reasonable potential and determine compliance with the TMDL.